

THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS TO FOSTER
RELIGION IN EDUCATION

Vol. XI

August, 1943

No. 3

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND THE FAITH OF THE FUTURE.....	J. Howard Howson	139
CHARLES THOMSON, FIRST AMERICAN N. T. TRANSLATOR—AN APPRAISAL.....	Kendrick Grobel	145
THE CONCEPTION OF GOD'S LAW IN THE PROPHETS AND IN JESUS.....	Ernest Findlay Scott	152
THE CONCEPTION OF HISTORY IN THE PROPHETS AND JESUS.....	Paul S. Minear	156
AN OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY AND SOME NEW TESTAMENT MIRACLES.....	C. P. Coffin	162
TEACHING RELIGION IN WAR TIME.....	L. B. Hazzard	167
PAUL AND SLAVERY (A COMMUNICATION).....	Edgar J. Goodspeed	169
SHOULD PROSPECTIVE MINISTERS MAJOR IN RELIGION AS UNDERGRADUATES? (A COMMUNICATION).....	J. Paul Williams	171
BOOK REVIEWS:		
LEE, UMPHREY, THE HISTORIC CHURCH AND MODERN PACIFISM.....		172
By A. J. Muste		
BRIGHTMAN, EDGAR S. (EDITOR), PERSONALISM IN THEOLOGY. ESSAYS IN HONOR OF ALBERT CORNELIUS KNUDSON.....		174
By Peter A. Bertocci		
CASE, SHIRLEY JACKSON, THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY.....		175
By Carl E. Purinton		
ROBINSON, H. WHEELER, REDEMPTION AND REVELATION.....		176
By James Muilenburg		
HORTON, WALTER MARSHALL, OUR ETERNAL CONTEMPORARY.....		178
By John W. Flight		
FILSON, F. V., ONE LORD, ONE FAITH.....		179
By Paul S. Minear		
CHAMBERLAIN, WILLIAM DOUGLAS, THE MEANING OF REPENTANCE.....		181
By Floyd V. Filson		
WALLIS, LOUIS, THE BIBLE IS HUMAN.....		181
CARTLEDGE, SAMUEL A., A CONSERVATIVE INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTA- MENT.....		183
By Charles F. Kraft		
WILDER, AMOS N., THE HEALING OF THE WATERS.....		184
By George C. Clancy		
BARON, JOSEPH L. (EDITOR), CANDLES IN THE NIGHT.....		185
BARON, JOSEPH L. (EDITOR), STARS AND SAND.....		185
By Carl E. Purinton		
JONES, RUFUS M., NEW EYES FOR INVISIBLES.....		185
By Louise S. Eby		
SOPER, EDMUND D., PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD MISSION.....		186
By Charles S. Braden		
BOOK NOTICES:		
WOOD, H. G., CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.....		189
By Carl E. Purinton		
MCCASLAND, S. VERNON, THE BIBLE IN OUR AMERICAN LIFE.....		189
MCCASLAND, S. VERNON, THE LITERATURE OF THE BIBLE.....		189
By Mary E. Andrews		
KIRKLAND, WINIFRED, THE MAN OF THE HOUR.....		190
By L. E. Train		
STAMM, FREDERICK KELLER, SEEING THE MULTITUDES.....		190
WARD, CANON JAMES EDWARD, THE MASTER ON THE MOUNT.....		190
By Carl E. Purinton		
WILLOUGHBY, HAROLD R., THE FIRST AUTHORIZED ENGLISH BIBLE AND THE CRANMER PREFACE.....		190
By Elmer W. K. Mould		

ANDERSON, WILLIAM FRANKLIN, HAMMER AND SPARKS.....	191
By Carl E. Purinton	
HERBERT, A. G., THE THRONE OF DAVID.....	191
By Eugene S. Ashton	
THE ASSOCIATION:	
A TRIBUTE TO THE RETIRING TREASURER.....	192
PERSONNEL	192

THE CONTRIBUTOR'S COLUMN

J. HOWARD HOWSON is Professor and Head of the Department of Religion at Vassar College. His article is a revision of a paper read before the psychology section of the Week-of-Work of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education at Swarthmore College, September 8, 1942. It was written against the background of the discussions of a group which had been studying the psychology of faith throughout the winter.

WM. KENDRICK GROBEL is a member of the Mission of Fellowship to Europe of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at present on loan to the Unitarian Service Committee as Associate European Commissioner in refugee relief work at Lisbon, Portugal. He is a graduate of the Chicago Theological Seminary; received the Th. D. under Martin Dibelius at Heidelberg, 1934; was instructor in N. T. at Hartford Theological Seminary, 1934-36; and was pastor of the Congregational Church, Stafford Springs, Conn., 1936-43.

The article by ERNEST FINDLAY SCOTT is a paper read at a meeting of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research on January 16, 1943. Dr. Scott's last book was *The Nature of the Early Church*.

PAUL S. MINEAR is Professor of New Testament Interpretation at Garrett Biblical Institute. His paper on "The Conception of History in the Prophets and Jesus", was read as part of the same symposium to which Professor E. F. Scott contributed at the January, 1943, meeting of the CSBR. A more detailed study of the problem of "time" will be published by Dr. Minear in the *Journal of Religion* soon.

CHARLES PORTER COFFIN was a Chicago business man who made biblical scholarship his hobby, as evidenced by the following articles: Two Sources for the Synoptic Account of the Last Supper, printed as a Critical Note, *American Journal of Theology*, January, 1901; The Meaning of I

(Concluded on page 188)

Published in February, May, August and November by the National Association of Biblical Instructors. Publication Office, 36 East Main Street, Somerville, New Jersey. Editorial Office, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin. The subscription price is \$3.00 per annum. Single copies, 75 cents. Entered as second-class matter February 14, 1939, at the post office at Somerville, New Jersey, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

VOLUME XI

AUGUST · 1943

PART 3

The Christian Faith and the Faith of the Future*

J. HOWARD HOWSON

CHRISTIANITY IS a historical religion. It reaches back nineteen hundred years as a distinctive religion. It has permeated the cultural life of many different peoples. It has been the religion of some sixty generations of Christians. Each of these peoples, each of these generations, has seen it in the light of its own peculiar problems and its own distinctive world-outlook. Furthermore, the Christian faith at any given age, in any given country, has its own levels of complexity. There is the faith which may be expressed in a series of dogmas. Behind these dogmas are the values of which the dogmas are the current conceptualization. Behind the values are the elemental attitudes of life-affirmation or life-denial.

A consideration of the Christian faith can appropriately begin with the faith of Jesus; but the faith of Jesus was not distinctively Christian. Jesus was a Jew. His faith was nurtured in Judaism. What is that faith? Here again we encounter the complexity that we have ascribed to the Christian faith. It is easy to over-simplify. We must caution against any analysis as being exhaustive. However, there were certain great convictions, certain great affirmations, that characterized the Jewish faith. To the Jew at the time of Jesus the created universe was the expression of God. And God was righteous to the point of holiness. Thus there was no fundamental dualism between the world and God, or between man as such and God, for man was created in the image of God. The universe was inherently moral as the

expression of a holy God. To be sure, the devil had introduced into the world the chaotic element of a perverse will, and the contemporary course of world events was under the devil's power. Nevertheless, good would triumph because goodness was, by definition, conformity to the will of Almighty God, who would ultimately prevail over the devil. The triumph would be no abstract ethereal victory, but a concrete and material triumph on an earth released from the principle of evil, with all its chain of devastating effects on the order of creation. This triumph would not come about through the initiative of man. God would send His messenger in due season to bring it about. In contrast to the prophetic strain in earlier Judaism, the apocalypticism of the period was lacking in faith in the capacity of the Jewish people to alter their destiny. The individual man could but be obedient to the revealed will of God in the Torah and pray hopefully for the future. There was no way by which he could guarantee the collective destiny of Israel or his own personal destiny. Salvation was the gift of God to those whom, in the impenetrable privacy of His infinite wisdom, He found faithful and deserving.

Jesus inherited this faith. It formed the background of his distinctive teaching. There is no evidence that he rejected the idea of a unique relationship between Israel and God which was such a fundamental tenet of Judaism. On the other hand, the evidence that he stressed the idea is not too

cogent if one accepts the general principles of Form Criticism. To the writer, the distinctive element in Jesus' faith was his faith in man. Throughout the Synoptics people stand before Jesus as personalities. Whether it be men or women, children or adults, Jews or Gentiles, Publicans or Pharisees, Jesus approaches them as persons. Sex, age, religion, race, class, are all secondary to his primary concern for the quality of their motivation. This concern is no merely professional concern. It is the interest of a person with a profound self-respect, searching them, as he searches himself, with keen moral discrimination. Because of this inherent faith in people, his conception of God, which outwardly was the same as that of the current Judaism, is given a quality of tender understanding that humanizes the apartness involved in holiness.

The question has been raised whether a person professing an authoritarian religion can be a free personality. Jesus' religion was most assuredly authoritarian. Yet never was there a freer person than Jesus. His initiative was preserved in the discrimination he made between the greater and lesser demands of the Torah. His soul was free because he was convinced that God had willed His laws for the benefit of mankind; and in this conviction he had a living principle by which he escaped the shackles of pedantic legalism. Jesus bowed before God, not in slavish submission, but in the reverent affirmation of his whole nature to God's service.

The disciples felt this outgoingness of Jesus. They felt the majestic quality of a soul released. They did not incorporate it in their theology, but it was transmitted to their fellowship. Paul caught it and conceptualized it, making it the very heart of Christianity. The spirit of Jesus was synonymous with personal triumph and release. And any one could possess this spirit. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female for ye are all one

in Christ Jesus." No nation, no class, no group, was large enough to encompass and confine the freeing spirit of Jesus.

A consulting psychologist has recently defined genuine faith as "experiencing life with one's whole self as worth living." Such was Jesus' faith. His experience was neither halting nor half-hearted. He was completely open to the life around him—the sowing of seed, the growth of vegetation, the blossoming of flowers, the signs of the weather, the homely routines of domestic life, the interplay of personalities, the self-revealing actions of people. Furthermore, his life was one of spontaneity and freedom, attributes which a well-known psychiatrist has described as characteristic of faith at its best. Jesus did not have to dramatize his mission as John the Baptist did in playing the role of an ancient prophet; nor did he conform to the current demands of orthodox piety. He moved among men with unconventional freedom and simplicity.

Historical Christianity has obscured this faith. Due to a variety of causes, world denial came to be regarded as a necessary condition for salvation and future happiness. It found expression in different forms—in asceticism of different kinds, in monasticism, in withdrawal from political responsibility. However, we may affirm that Jesus' characteristic faith will be an integral component of the faith of the future. Wherever men have studied with open-hearted sincerity the records of this incomparable life they have been lifted to a new appreciation of their own capacities.

The early Christians at Jerusalem expressed their faith in Jesus in the context of their apocalyptic hopes. They believed that he had been exalted to God's right hand in heaven, whence he would come as the Messiah to bring in the Kingdom of God. This was the manifest content of their faith. In the form in which they held it we can no longer accept it. Jesus did not come back. In the light of the historical criticism of the genesis of the belief

itself, and in the light of our own cosmology today, it is not being unduly dogmatic to assert that he will never come back. This aspect of Christian faith is not for the future.

Paul made Jesus' resurrection from the dead the cornerstone of his theological exposition; and until recently it has been an indispensable element of the Christian faith. Biblical criticism has shown that the Gospel accounts of the resurrection leave much to be desired as reliable historical records and many modern philosophies reject the occurrence as impossible. To what extent the faith of the future will accept this and how interpret it we can not predict. To some, at least, it will always stand as the symbol of the imperishable quality of Jesus' life, available from age to age to those who genuinely cultivate his spirit.

From the beginning of Christianity the new triumphant life in Jesus was expressed in a quality of fellowship within the Christian circle that transcended the ordinary level of human fellowship such as the Christians had experienced in other relationships. This was not true of all Christian groups, or of any Christian group all the time; but there was a Christian quality of life that captured the allegiance of converts and aroused the wonder of those outside. It was expressed freely at first in a joyful breaking of bread together and in the sharing of possessions. As the breathless expectancy of the first generation of Christians waned in the second and third generations, there was less of sharing and more of ritualistic expression in their common meals. But with Paul's triumph over the conservatives, Christianity became a brotherhood transcending all national frontiers and all nationalisms. Within the brotherhood there was security for those of the lowliest station; and the encompassing arm of the brotherhood embraced both rich and poor alike. Even though there was no overarching organization, the churches of Christendom corresponded with each other, and

traveling preachers went from church to church. There was a real catholicity of spirit long before it was expressed in institutional forms.

Unfortunately, Christianity inherited from Judaism the sense of an exclusive relation to God, so that, increasingly, the Christian fellowship regarded itself as the exclusive vehicle of God's salvation to mankind. As the fellowship crystallized in the church this concept became an integral part of the church's belief: *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. We have inherited that belief. To a greater or less degree, we regard ourselves in the Hebrew-Christian tradition as the unique inheritors of God's salvation. Christianity is the absolute or final religion. There is truth in other religions; but it is completed in Christianity. It is doubtful if the faith of the future will sustain this. Historical scholarship shows that other peoples have the same attitude towards their religion that we have towards ours. An attitude of exclusiveness, therefore, is an evidence rather of provincialism than of superiority. If we are to approach other peoples with an attitude of respect we must respect their religious insights, their religious literature, their religious fellowship. Furthermore, we need to realize that even Christianity is not sufficient to contain the spirit of Jesus. The Christianity of today, with its centuries long accumulation of theological speculation, is no more fit to confine the spirit of Jesus than was the Judaism of the time of Paul.

We may expect, therefore, that the faith of the future will not be a faith that limits world fellowship but one that extends fellowship through mutual understanding and appreciation.

One of the most tragic ironies of our contemporary religious situation is that the Lord's Supper which, according to Paul, is the expression of our solidarity in the possession of the spirit of Jesus, should be the point at which religious divisions are most acute. We can get an approximation of unity on some external activities, but in one

of the central affirmations of our faith, spiritual exclusiveness denies the reality of what is symbolized.

The Christian community was early faced with the necessity of protecting itself against an interpretation of Christianity that would have deprived it of its historical content. The answer to this was the Roman symbol which we know as the Apostles' Creed. It rejected in no uncertain terms the dualism between the God of Christ and the world of creation. Christianity affirms that, no matter how much man and the world have fallen away from their original state, they are of God and bear the stamp of God upon them.

This faith is being challenged from two different quarters today. It is challenged by those religious thinkers who reject natural theology in their effort to protect the wholly-other character of God. It is challenged also by those who regard man as the chance product of the interplay of purely mechanical forces. We may expect the faith of the future to reject both these views. If God be wholly-other, He can be brought into relation to the world and man only by theological legerdemain. If man be a product of natural forces then the study of man himself must be an indispensable element of the study of Nature. Not a reduced estimate of man, but an increased respect for the complexity of the forces that have given him birth is necessary.

We may expect this Christian faith in the world and man as the creation of God to be an integral part of the faith of the future, not in the sense of a naive anthropomorphic fashioning, to be sure, but in the sense of the continuity between God, as the ultimate ground of existence, and man, as a creature. Quite apart from membership in any cult, or participation in any rite, all men are children of God.

Augustine's interpretation of Christianity and his basic faith were tremendously influential in the development of Christianity.

When we remember that Protestantism was an outgrowth of Augustinianism and that the Roman Catholic conception of the relationship of church and state owes much to Augustine, we begin to realize the magnitude of his influence. Now Augustine had strong beliefs and disbeliefs that have been incorporated in Christian convictions. In the first place, he was a scholar with faith in reason. If what the Bible appeared to say was contrary to reason then there had to be another interpretation of the passage than that which immediately commended itself to the mind. He did not reject his reason in the maintenance of his faith. His faith was reasonable, even though, in a sense, it was above reason.

This faith in reason was characteristic of Scholasticism as it appeared in Medieval Roman Catholicism and is evident also in the New England Puritan theology. The whole world is a rationally consistent structure, in which logical categories attest the orderliness of the Divine mind. That faith came over into Deism and has been characteristic of the natural sciences in a modified form. In the natural sciences, proof of a fact has rested primarily on the reliability of observation rather than on its deduction from a logical scheme; and, at the present time, incontrovertibly attested facts are constantly upsetting the categories of explanation. But we need to remember that the sciences have often built up rigid pictures of the world on the basis of their particular approach, and have yielded to the compulsions of facts that have imperiled their logical superstructure only after long and bitter fighting. Many thinkers still believe in the possibility of reducing all the manifold phenomena of life to a consistent logical system.

Augustine's attempt at system building broke down at the point of sin. His own experience of sin was too vivid to permit him to regard it as merely an imperfect form of good or the absence of good. He knew it as a perversion of the will, for which

there was no rational explanation. In fact, its very irrationality was the mark of its diabolical quality. Yet his own Neo-Platonic background would not allow him to believe in sin as an autonomous principle eternally existent. His solution was a verbal compromise, in which he had God permitting sin although not the author of it.

The writer is of the opinion that all attempts to reduce the phenomena of life to a single logically consistent system are foredoomed to failure. For this reason, rationality, i. e. the placing of an item in a logical system of relationships, can never be the ultimate test of reality, nor can the inability so to place an item be the final ground for its rejection as unreal or false. The ultimate test for a fact must be the character of the evidence. Rationality must always be subordinate to experienced facts.

Theology is the rationalism of religion. To the degree, therefore, that theology presents a beautifully consistent and *complete* picture of the spiritual life of man in relation to the cosmos, himself, and his fellowmen, just to that degree may it be regarded with suspicion. The ultimate answer to life is not the intellectual elaboration of theological concepts, important as they are, but rather the organization of life in which the balance of good over evil is maintained in action.

The faith of the future, therefore, will be primarily concerned with the response of the whole man to life rather than with the conformity of his beliefs to a particular theology.

In the second place, Augustine had a profound distrust of man's capacity to organize his own impulses so as to achieve salvation. Salvation was possible only through the grace of God mediated through the sacraments of the church. This raises two questions for the faith of the future. The first is the capacity of man to organize his own experience. The second is the nature and place of grace and the whole sacramental life.

Modern psychotherapy would recognize that one cannot organize one's discordant nature by an act of the will. One must understand the reasons for the discord and be willing to yield oneself to experiences that will gradually heal the spiritual dislocation. Healing comes from a quality in the larger life, of which we are a part rather than from a particular act of will. Hence there is a givenness in the healing that is not of ourselves. This is grace. It is an inflow of spiritual power that occurs when we give up our ego-centricity and yield ourselves to a larger life. It comes in various experiences and under varying circumstances. It is not the monopoly of any religion, any culture, or any age. And, wherever it is experienced, the act in which it occurs becomes a sacrament.

The great mistake of organized Christianity has been to subordinate the sacraments to ecclesiasticism. The mystics felt this, and Luther expressed it in his doctrine of vocation, when he realized the possibility of cobbling to the glory of God. To the transformed person, all life becomes a sacrament as spiritual power flows in to his receptive soul, which has been opened to the spiritual life of the cosmos and to the spiritual life of his fellowmen. The faith of the future will be far more sacramental than at present. This does not mean that the church will cease to mediate grace. On the contrary. As the church subordinates its ecclesiasticism to the sacramental, it will be more humbly, but more completely, sacramental in its ministry.

Another of Luther's contributions to the faith of the future was his realization that man is not saved by slavish submission to a multitude of duties. Man is saved only through justification, to use Luther's term. We may state it in psychological terms by saying that man is saved only by a re-orientation to life, so that he yields to the healing experiences, rather than by filling his personality with a tangle of conflicting tensions. This is a re-emphasis in slightly

different form of Augustine's position that salvation can not come from one's own striving. Grace is as necessary for spiritual living today as it was in the days when salvation came only through the church.

The faith of the future will be a continuation of those deepest faiths of Christianity that have persisted from age to age. It is the affirmation of a life that has been enriched by the experiences of countless souls who have been nurtured in the Christian tradition. It is the affirmation of life that is also to be found in the religious geniuses of other religions and cultures. Christianity has no monopoly of this faith. In fact, it needs a living contact with other peoples to overcome the provincialisms that overlie and obscure the universality of its faith. This faith it expresses in various theologies. These theologies involve differ-

ent cosmologies and different epistemologies; but they are not the essence of the Christian faith. The Christian faith which we may expect to live on is a faith in a value-supporting cosmic order, of which each of us is a partial expression. As we open ourselves to the full nature of this life that flows through us all, we receive a strength that comes as from without, and we are caught up in a quality of fellowship we had not dreamed possible. This fellowship is both cosmic and social. On the cosmic side it is expressed in worship, prayer and sacramental living. On the social side it is expressed in a quality of living with one's fellowmen that combines a sense of the whole human family with a feeling for that upreach of spirit that is to be found in even the humblest human being.

Charles Thomson, First American N. T. Translator---An Appraisal

KENDRICK GROBEL

"FIRSTS" IN the lore of Bible-collecting do not necessarily interest the scholar, but there is one American "first," curiously neglected by scholars, that deserves wider fame and the serious attention of Biblical scholars: the Charles Thomson Bible¹. Such attention as it has received from collectors centers upon two secondary facts, that it contains the first English translation of the LXX², and that it was the first Bible printed by a woman. But its greater significance is that it includes the first English New Testament to be translated and published in America. Even if it were of indifferent quality, this Testament should be worthy of note as a pioneer, and all the more so if it prove to be vivid, suggestive,

and scholarly. One naturally asks who this venturesome American was who in the time of the Revolution began, and finally published, the first American translation of the N.T. and the world's first English translation of the LXX.

In 1739 a ship-load of Scotch-Irish Presbyterian refugees was landed at Newcastle, Del. Among them was a ten-year-old orphan, whose widowed father had been committed to the waves within sight of land. That boy was Charles Thomson. He was to distinguish himself on these shores in four distinct careers. Sheltered for the first few months by a blacksmith's family in Newcastle, he overheard the smith planning to have him indentured as apprentice. But the fledgling aspired higher than the forge and ran away that night. On the road a woman traveler accosted him and asked him what he wanted to be. The precocious reply that he wanted to be a scholar so pleased her that she took him home and put him in school. It is a lasting memorial to her unknown name that he did become a scholar. Through various benefactors he received a sound classical education in the private academy³ of Dr. contemporary president of Yale, called "the greatest classical scholar in America."

The first of Thomson's careers was teaching. At 21 he was appointed tutor in the Latin and Greek school of the Academy of Philadelphia⁵ through the good offices of Benjamin Franklin, president of its board of trustees. There he taught five years. His only other teaching position was as master of the Friends' Public Schools, Philadelphia, 1757-60. In his second career, beginning 1760, he was a prosperous importer; thus he personally felt the ad-

¹*The Holy Bible*, containing the Old and New Covenant, commonly called the Old and New Testament; translated from the Greek by Charles Thomson, Late Secretary to the Congress of the United States. Philadelphia: Printed by Jane Aitken, No. 71, North Third Street. 1808. (4 vols., 8 vo).

²Probably also the first into any modern language. I can learn of none in German or any other living language but English. A second English LXX was published by an Americo-Englishman in 1844: "The Septuagint Version, according to the Vatican text, translated into English; with various readings from the Alexandrian copy"; by Sir L. C. L. Brenton, Bart., 2 vols. London, S. Bagster, 1844. Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton was a son of Sir Jahleel Brenton, a Rhode Island-born British admiral descended from an old American loyalist family. The first modern translation from the LXX was the neo-Latin one in Bonacursius' Greek and Latin Psalter, Milan, 1481. Edwin A. R. Rumball-Petre informs me that a Latin version of the LXX, translator unknown, was printed at Basle by Cratandrum in 1526. Ancient daughter-translations of the LXX include the Ethiopic, Armenian, Arabic, Bohairic, Old Latin, Sahidic, Syro-Hexaplar, and Palestinian Syriac versions, in whole or in part.

³At New London, Penn. This school, moved, became Delaware College at Newark, Del.

Francis Alison⁴, the man whom Ezra Stiles,

⁴Second pastor of the Presbyterian Church, New London, Penn.

⁵After 1791, the University of Pennsylvania.

verse effects of the Stamp Act and so vigorously opposed it that John Adams labeled him in his Diary "The Sam Adams of Philadelphia, the life of the cause of liberty, they say." This political prominence inducted Thomson into the best known of his careers: at the formation of the Continental Congress in 1774 he was chosen its secretary. He continued in that office throughout the fifteen years' existence of that body, highly respected and popularly known as The Man of Truth. His last act in this capacity was to proceed as messenger of the First Congress of the U.S., then sitting in New York, to Mount Vernon to notify George Washington of his election to the presidency of the United States. On the president-elect's triumphal journey to New York his private secretary (Col. David Humphreys) and Charles Thomson were his entire retinue.

Apparently considered too old for a post in the new government, though only 60, Thomson was retired. Not without regret

he withdrew to his wife's country estate, Harriton—from her maiden name: Harris—near Bryn Mawr, to live another 35 years.⁶ Henceforth a gentleman-farmer, far from taking his well-earned ease, he engaged at once in his fourth and most surprising career, the twenty-year task of revising and perfecting a translation of the whole Greek Bible which he had somehow found time to make amid the bustle of his Congressional and mercantile activities. That it was made before his retirement is proved by a letter of Timothy Pickering to his wife, Dec. 16, 1789, just after he had visited Thomson at Harriton: "He is now revising his translation of the Bible, which one day perhaps may be published to the world."⁷ This work, a "first" in both Old and New Testaments, was published by Jane Aitken⁸, Philadelphia, in 1808. Thomson intended to issue it as a quarto, but was persuaded by his friend⁹, Thomas Jefferson, to publish it in four volumes, octavo. The fourth volume, containing the New Covenant, will alone occupy us here.

Neither the whole work nor the N.T. has a preface of any kind, though there is an "Advertisement to the Reader" at the end of Vol. III. It has single-column pages with the verse-numbers in the left margin (except in chapter I of Matthew, where they are entirely omitted), rational paragraphing, and no pagination; the N.T. has signatures running A to 3N. The printer frequently forgot to number the last verse or two of a chapter.

There can be no doubt that Thomson consulted the King James version while translating—he leaves many verses exactly as in it, and in the most familiar passages even forsakes his habitual mannerisms to preserve as far as he can the traditional rendering. I think it likely that he also consulted the Vulgate.¹⁰ But the strongest—and worst—influence upon his version was the translation of Gilbert Wakefield (London, 1791), a brilliant but erratic English Unitarian. One would never suspect this

⁶He died Aug. 16, 1824, in his 95th year.

⁷*Life of Timothy Pickering*, by Chas. W. Upham, vol. II, p. 436.

⁸Daughter of the distinguished printer, Robert Aitken; she had succeeded to his business.

⁹In Jefferson's letter from Washington, Jan. 11, 1808, Jefferson's *Works* XI, p. 6; in a later letter to Thomson, Jefferson begins, "My dear and ancient friend,—An acquaintance of fifty-two years, for I think ours dates from 1764, calls for an interchange of notice now and then." (*Works*, XI, p. 498) The two men were fellow members, and officers, of the American Philosophical Society.

¹⁰Examples: Acts 16:35 *hlabdouchoi* "lictors," Vg. *lictors*; Acts 19:27 "majesty," Vg. *majestas*, followed by Wyclif, Rheims; Acts 24:27 *Porkios* "Portius" conforms to Vg. (so also Rheims); Rom. 5:20 "superabounded," Vg. *superabundavit*; Rom. 15:6 "unanimously," Vg. *unanimis*.

¹¹In the Library of the Mass. Hist. Soc., presented in 1832 by John F. Watson, the annalist of Philadelphia. It consists of 39 closely written pages, small octavo, commenting on the Notes in Wakefield's Testament, London edition of 1791. The recurrent remark, "Let the reader judge," indicates that it was written for other eyes than the author's own. The repeated apology, "I will trouble you with a long note," suggests that the whole was undertaken for the information of an individual, possibly Thomas Jefferson; however I can find no allusion to it in Jefferson's correspondence. It was written after Thomson's translation was completed, but bears no date.

influence from reading Thomson's caustic "Observations on some of Mr. Wakefield's Notes" in a little MS note-book.¹¹ Thomson there accuses him, usually justly, of ignorance, impertinence, and insolent conceit, but never confesses his own frequent indebtedness to Wakefield for striking—and often fantastic—suggestions. But this indebtedness will be abundantly attested below from the translation itself.

For the Old Testament Thomson used an edition of Field's Septuagint, but what edition of the N. T. text he used has not been ascertained. It can only have been some uncritical copy of the "textus receptus" with some meager indication of variants. He consulted Karl Gottfried Woide's edition of Codex Alexandrinus (London, 1786) or quoted it at second hand. His footnotes show that he knew, presumably at second hand, of the Syriac and Arabic versions, since it is highly improbable that he knew any of the Semitic languages. Departures from the *textus receptus* have been noticed at Acts 9 20, 11 20, I Cor 9 22, and I Jn 5 6-8.

Before recording a hearty approval of Thomson's version as a whole, it is well to note some of its shortcomings. Mt 8 7 renders *elthōn therapeusō auton* "I was coming; I will cure him," taking the aorist participle to mean antecedent, not timeless, action. In Mk 14 3, following Wakefield, he reads, "shaking (*syntripsasa*) the phial, she poured . . .:" but *syntribō* never means "shake." The *charis theou* upon the boy Jesus (Lk 2 40) becomes "a divine gracefulness," evidently suggested by Wakefield's "a divine comeliness." Again following Wakefield he rationalistically lets Jesus spend the night not in prayer, but in "a place set apart for prayer" (Lk 6 12)—i. e., a *proseuchē* in the sense of Acts 16 13. In Lk 7 47 he tries to rescue the non-occidental logic in the remarks about the woman who anointed Jesus by translating *hoti ēgapēsen poly*: "therefore her love is great." The hyperbole of the last verse of John

(the world would not *contain* the books) had been too much for the rationalism of Wakefield, who had translated, "I do not think that the world even then would *receive* the books;" Thomson followed with "cordially receive." (This sense of *choreō* does occur in Mt. 19 11.) At Heb. 2 5 *oikoumenē* comes out as "dispensation," as also in Wakefield. (I cannot find that the word ever had that meaning, but perhaps Wakefield regarded it as implied by the use of the verb *oikeō*=manage.) *Matanoia* receives a too ingenious translation in Heb 12 17—again in Wakefield's tracks—where both translators tell us that Esau "found no way to change his *father's* mind! (Is there any evidence that *metanoia* even implied other than a purely subjective change?) Examples of similar errors could be multiplied.

Probably the first thing that strikes the reader of Thomson's version is the relative rarity of certain theological terms. But the layman Thomson has not so sweepingly "de-theologized" as some writers imply. Thus *gospel* occurs only 13 times; *glad tidings* (57) is the usual expression; *good news* occurs 5, *message of peace* once. *Euangelizō* is never *preach*, but usually *proclaim* (34) or *publish* (12). *Basileia* remains *kingdom* two-thirds of the time, especially when governed by a spatial preposition, but Thomson's preference seems to be for *reign*. For *repent* and *repentance* he prefers *reform* and *reformation*, also using *change of mind* (3) and once, tellingly, *the turning of the mind toward God* (Acts 20 21). *Temptation* usually becomes *trial*. In Romans *grace* occurs only once, *favour* 22 times. In the Gospels *pistis* is predominantly *faith*, but in Romans the too intellectual word *belief* predominates over *faith* two to one; four times the gerund *believing* is effectively used. *Dikaioō* is usually *acquit* (Wakefield), *dikaïosynē* usually *righteousness*; also *justification*, and once *acquittal* (Rom 5 16). *Church* occurs only

once (Mt 16 18); otherwise it is *congregation* (once *assembly*, Acts 19 38). *Makarios* is nearly always *happy*; *blessed* only with attributes of the Trinity. *Skandalizesthai* is usually *be stumbled* (this queer idiom was good English in 1800; it had been used by Milton and occurred as recently as 1888 in *Bibliotheca Sacra* XLV, p. 616.) In Hebrews *angelos* divides: *angel* 6, *messenger* 7, in exact agreement, passage for passage, with Wakefield! In all this a certain accommodation to every-day speech is undeniable, but what is theological language, after all, but a specific use of every-day language?

In the Epistles the most striking phenomenon is the typographical rearrangements that Thomson has undertaken to clarify the progress of the thought, notably in the use of the dialogue form. It is a striking testimony to Thomson's good stylistic feeling that he almost always coincides in the use of this form with Bultmann's analysis¹² of the diatribe-form in Paul, conspicuous in which was the assumption of a fictitious opponent for an apparent debate. This device is found at Rom 3 1-19, 7 7-13, 9 14, 30-32, 10 14—II 11, I Cor 4 8-11, 6 12-13, II Cor 3 1, Gal 3 19-21. His liberal use of parentheses is often very helpful (Mt 14 3-12, Gal 2 6-8, etc.); likewise his re-punctuations. But I have noted the following as questionable or objectionable rearrangements: Jn 5 31-39, Acts 14 22-23, II Cor 3 17, 11 32. The last is a curious instance of the LXX's influence upon Thomson; he evidently read: *theos ho On, eulogētos ktl*, and translated, "God . . . the *self-existent*, ever-blessed being." He knew not wisely but too well the LXX rendering of Ex 3 14, Jer 1 6, etc. (cf Thomson's Jer 1 6).

Though this translation as a whole certainly cannot be accused of being too literal,

certain too pedantic accommodations to the Greek grammar almost anticipate the bizarre literalisms of Julia Smith's version. In Thomson, for instance, the number of a noun or the voice of a verb may be retained in defiance of idiom: thus *ta sabbata*, even when it clearly refers to *one* Sabbath only, is made plural Mt 12 1, Mk 1 21, 2 23, Lk 4 31, etc. (also in O. T.), but, correctly singular at Lk 13 10. The passive deponent *koimasthai* is taken too seriously in Thomson's favorite rendering *be composed to rest*. (I Cor 15; I Th 4, *passim*). Thomson seems to have had the misconception that a literal correspondence of the Greek and the English definite articles is possible. (Are there *any* two languages where that is wholly true?) Thus Lk 2 25 has "*a* holy spirit," the next verse "*the* holy spirit," as if they were discrete. Especially with *holy spirit* is the presence or absence of the article over-scrupulously observed. But a gratuitous *the* is inserted Acts 17 23 and Rom 1 18. Many times he over-emphasizes the Greek definite article by rendering it with a demonstrative, as at Mt 16 23, Gal 3 19, and often. On the other side of the grammatical balance, Thomson is to be commended for recognizing the *hina*-result-clause (Mt 1 22, 2 15, 23, 8 17, Lk 9 45, and often) and translating accordingly. An English solecism crept in at Acts 13 1: "There was . . . prophets"—perhaps a typographical error, but possibly the author's intention; the 18th century judged this error more mildly than the 20th.

Any translator finds himself forced into making some interpretative interpolations. Some of Thomson's are ingenious: in Mt. 5 28 he renders: "whosoever looketh on a *married* woman," perhaps only by good luck—or did he know that adultery in Israel was legally the infringement of another man's property rights, and that therefore a husband's lechery with an unmarried woman was not adultery? (So Dibelius, Klostermann, Nowack, et al.) For insert-

¹²*Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*. Göttingen 1910. (Forschungen zur Rel. und Lit. des A. und N.T., herausgegeben von W. Bousset and H. Gunkel. 13. Heft).

ing "twins" in Rom 9 10—because they are implied in the next verse—Thomson had good precedent in Wyclif and Wakefield; 20th Century, Moffatt, Goodspeed did the same. He is also probably right in supplying the subjects *John* and *Jesus* to verbs in Mt 3 15, 16. Less certain is the clever insertion of "but not directly to Nazareth" between Jn 4 43 and 44 in order to give relevance to *gar*, verse 44. (Bultmann regards verse 44 as an interpolation of the evangelist into his source.) Wakefield misled him into introducing *children* unnecessarily into Heb 11 35 and *father's* into Heb 12 17. In I Cor 7 36 Thomson curiously supplies *she* as subject of *thelei*: "What *she* willeth, let him do,"—surely wrongly; but even Hans Achelis (*Virgines Subintroductae*, p. 25) finds a similar shift of subject required in the clause immediately following. Entirely mistaken is the insertion of "the followers of Christ" in Rom 9 3 as those upon whom Paul wished (i. e. had wished) an anathema.

One great excellence of Thomson is his rendering of technical expressions, especially in legal contexts. For example: "The apostles and elders were *convened* to *deliberate*" (Acts 15 6). Out of a multitude of such passages I cannot refrain from quoting the letter in Acts 23:

"Claudius Lysias to his excellency general Felix, health and happiness.

"This man was seized by the Jews and just upon the point of being slain by them, when I came up with the army and rescued him. Having learned that he is a Roman and being desirous to know the crime of which they accused him, I took him down to their

Sanhedrim, and found that he¹³ was accused of matters touching questions of their law, but had done nothing that deserved death or imprisonment. But receiving intelligence of a plot against the man, which the Jews were in act to execute, I have sent him to thee and directed his accusers to lay before thee their charges against him. Farewell."

The speeches of Acts 24 and 25 show the same fluent sureness in legal terminology, suggesting Thomson's long experience in Congress. Other idiomatic expressions tempt one to infer associations with other phases of his varied life. A slight mistranslation in Gal 5 1 is worthy of the "Sam Adams of Philadelphia:" "*stand up for* the liberty with which Christ hath made us free!" One would like to see the well-attested Quaker influence on Thomson's life¹³ in his refusal to let God swear in Heb 3, 11, 18 4 3 (instead, Thomson lets him "solemnly say"), were it not that he otherwise renders *omnyō* "swear" without compunction. And would one need to be told that a farmer translated II Pet 2 22?—"the washed hog (is returned) to its wallowing slough!"

But in connection with Thomson's use of technical language, legal or otherwise, it must be said that he has a tendency toward overtranslation—i. e., to substitute a too technical term for a more general one in a passage with technical content. Out of a number of cases let three suffice: Acts 25 27 "without *specifying* the *charge* against him." (*Charge* is good for *aitias*, though differing in number; but *sēmainō* means merely *indicate*, not *specify*.) Rom 6 17 "you have *conformed* to the *mould* of doctrine in which you were *cast*." (*Typos* can mean *mould*—e. g., Plato's Republic 402 D; but *paradothēnai* means *delivered*, not *cast*.) I Cor 7 32 "The *scenery* of this world is *shifting*." (*Paragō* can mean *shift*, and it has associations—but not the modern one! with the drama, but the choice of *scenery*

¹³He had been an elder, also a trustee, of the First Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia; he never seems to have severed himself formally from that denomination. Inwardly he probably became a deist like his friend and kindred spirit, Thomas Jefferson. Thomson's second wife was a Friend; he had taught in the Friends' Schools; and most of his life was spent in the Quaker capital of America.

for *schēma* is possible only by regarding it as figurative for *outward appearance*; certainly the conjunction of the two words is misleading.) To such overtranslations this version owes some small part of its unusual vividness, but far from all of it.

Thomson naturally modernizes most of the archaisms of the King James Bible, but the fact that he introduces new ones reminds us that even in the last century-and-a-quarter our language has sloughed off many old locutions. "Be stumbled" has been noted above. "Bridemen" (*hyioi tou nymphōnos*, Mt 9 15) was used as recently as 1830 by Carlyle, but is unknown to us. "Fainty," Mt 9 36, now obsolete, meant "inclined to swoon." "Improveth," Mt 13 12, 25 29, in the sense of "utilize" is a pure Yankeeism, now probably dead. (That Thomson intended this meaning is assured by his comment, correct or not, on Wakefield's Notes: "*echō* . . . to use or exercise what one has.") The "wine lake" (*lēnon* Mt 21 33), a vat, came into English many centuries ago from the similar Latin use of *lacus*—e. g., Vulgata, Rev 14 20, where Wyclif renders "lake." "Obtested" Acts 2 40, "call heaven to witness," may not be obsolete, but is certainly archaic. "The sex" Rom 1 27, for "women" sounds specifically Victorian to us, but the Oxford Dictionary attests it for the period 1589-1863, calling it "now rare." "That you may know *experimentally* what the will of God is," Rom 12 2, calls to mind the Great Awakening with its deep concern for "experimental religion," by which the 18th century meant what we call "religious experience." "At a loose from righteousness," Rom 6 20, preserves an obsolete noun noted by the Oxford Dictionary from 1593-1772 and meaning "a state of unrestraint." Some other archaisms are: "feel a complacency" (*eudochō*, II Cor 12 10), "frustrate" as an adjective, Gal 2 2; "bashful" in the sense of "chaste," I Tim 2 9. But strange as these expressions may now seem to us, they were all up-to-date

English within Thomson's lifetime. He was making a "modern" translation.

I have noted a hundred instances of strikingly good translation, but space permits mention of only a few, more or less at random. Mt 9 16 borders on "overtranslation" and yet is very good:

"No one mendeth an old garment with a patch of undressed cloth; for such a patch teareth the garment and maketh a greater rent."

He succinctly paraphrases *eis onoma prophētou*, etc., "on account of his being a prophet, etc." (Cf. the Norwegian version.) *Diephēmisthē ho logōs houtos* (Mt 28 15) becomes: "This is the current report . . ." Peter and John are described (Acts 4 13) as "illiterate men and in private stations of life" (*agrammatōi kai idiōtai*). *Mēden diakrithēnai* receives several skilful translations: *without wavering* (Mt 21 21); *without any cavilling* (Acts 10 20); *without any scruple* (Acts 11 12). Paul the *spermologos*, Acts 17 18, is called "this retailer of scraps"—Goodspeed: "rag-picker." The *dikaiōsis zōēs* of Rom 5 18 is rendered "an adjudication of life." *Phronēma* is always rendered "bent"—"bent of the flesh," etc. (Rom 8 6, 6, 7, 27). The *pleonexia* of II Cor 9 5 is "an extorted gift:" cf. Norwegian: "*en karrig Gave*"—(a stingy gift.) Paul, who was *agnooumenos tō prosōpō* (Gal 1, 22) was "personally unknown" (cf. 20th Century, Goodspeed, Norwegian). At Heb 1 7 God does not "make his angels spirits," but "winds his messengers." The difficult definition of faith, Heb 11 1, is rendered somewhat wordily but well: "a confident expectation of things hoped for; a convincement of the mind with respect to the reality of things not seen." A puzzling piece of insight is the translation of *en tō parapi-krasmō* (Heb 3 8, quoting Ps 94/95 8) as a place: "at Bitterness." Hebrew scholars seem now to be unanimous in regarding both *Meribah* and *Massah* in the original as place-names, but how Thomson came to

that conclusion from the Greek text alone, I cannot say; he himself had not so rendered in Psalm 95. Over against these and countless other felicitous expressions could be entered many a clumsiness in translation, but the good easily outweighs the bad.

The vividness and freshness of the Thomson version fully justify the gusto with which Rendel Harris used to quote it in his lectures at Haverford College, whose president, Thomas Chase, had probably introduced him to it, though he could have known it through the favorable notice it had received in Britain. William Orme,

"This transatlantic work is creditable to America, and to the learned author. It is the only English version¹⁵ of the Septuagint, and

¹⁴*Bibliotheca Biblica*, Edinburgh, 1824, p. 429.

¹⁵But see Note 2, above.

is therefore worthy of attention, as well as for the fidelity with which it is executed. The New Testament contains many improved renderings and arrangements."

for instance, had written¹⁴:

President Thomas Chase, one of the American Revision Committee, says that "Thomson's excellent translation was several times referred to in the Revision Committee, and always with great respect," adding that "even any novel suggestion it made would be thought worth looking into." One can only marvel at the insight and relative accuracy of this solitary layman-translator, who without any of our present aids succeeded in making so good a translation in the infancy of American scholarship. No one need be ashamed of the first American translation of the New Testament.

The Conception of God's Law in the Prophets and in Jesus

ERNEST FINDLAY SCOTT

A LAW IS a mode of action imposed on all the members of a community. There may indeed be laws, and these among the most binding, which we impose on ourselves personally; but even here the communal idea is involved. You act rightly, as Kant has recognized, when you follow a rule which might safely be made universal. Life is impossible unless individual wills are brought into harmony with the larger will, and behind law there must therefore be some authority. It seems originally to have been nothing but custom. Among the Indian tribes in Western Canada there is nothing that can be called a legal system, but a great number of customs have been handed down through many generations. The business of the chief is to know them, and to see that they are rigorously maintained. This was also the function of the king in ancient times. His commandment was law, but he did not make the law, although it was executed in his name. He stood for the national traditions, by which he was himself bound more rigidly than any of his subjects, and the strongest autocrat was doomed as soon as he dared to trifle with an established custom. To begin with, therefore, law and custom meant the same thing. A mode of action might be irrational and even hurtful, but so long as it was rooted in the habits of the community it had to be followed. Sometimes it had no other sanction than that of custom. The thing which had always been done was right, and must continue to be done. More often it was enforced by connecting it with the tutelary god. For some reason of his own he had instituted this rule, and his people were compelled to follow it. The king or law-giver who codified the rules did

not claim to be more than an intermediary. Hammurabi is pictured as receiving his laws at the hands of the god. Moses brings down the tables of stone from the divine presence on Mount Sinai. Lycurgus is taught by the oracle, and Numa Pompilius by the goddess. In primitive times no distinction was made between divine and human law. All laws were of the nature of divine commandments, and were therefore to be obeyed. It is significant that the words "law" and "religion" are from the same root; they are, in fact, variants of the same word. The idea in both of them is "that which binds."

The religious conception of law was particularly strong in Israel. Among other peoples the idea steadily gained ground that men were free to legislate for themselves by duly constituted agents,—kings, senates, assemblies. Israel held fast to the belief that God's law alone was valid. This was no doubt due in large measure to the conception of Israel as a theocracy,—a conception which was never abandoned, even in the days of kingship. God was the Lord, the true King of Israel, and the official kings, as the prophets were always reminding them, were only the vassals of God. No law could have binding force unless it proceeded from God. This sense of law as divine was also dependent, to a still greater extent, on the Hebrew conception of God as righteous. Justice, for the Hebrew mind, was the supreme attribute of God, and his laws therefore could not be set aside or amended. In Israel, as elsewhere, law had grown out of custom, but it needs to be remembered that Hebrew customs had formed themselves in accordance with moral instincts which had always been powerful.

In the face of heathen cruelties and immoralities the Hebrew could truly say, "It is not so done in Israel." Much in the ancient customs may be traced back to primitive superstition and taboo, but the moral sense had been operative from the very outset. When the customs were at last crystallized as laws, they were found to connect themselves with moral principles. They could be accepted by thoughtful men, even in the later period, as laws enacted by God.

It is often assumed that the prophets inaugurated a new chapter in the history of religion. They made the grand discovery that the world is morally ordered, and that God is sovereign because he upholds the moral law. It was indeed the prophets, and especially the great writing prophets, who gave clear and magnificent expression to this truth, but they did not proclaim it for the first time. As far back as we can go it was acknowledged by all pious Israelites that God defended the righteous and punished the wicked. This is assumed in those stories in Genesis which reflect the earliest Hebrew traditions. The prophets, for that part, did not begin with Amos. There had always been men who spoke in God's name, and one of their functions had been to assert the moral law. Nathan rebuked David for an act of injustice, and David confessed that he had sinned. Elijah rebuked Ahab, and Ahab likewise was aware that he had broken God's law and must abide the consequences. It is very noteworthy that the prophets appeal to a conscience which already exists. Amos can take for granted that the people know what God requires. He does not reveal certain moral principles, hitherto unknown, but speaks to those who acknowledge God's law and have sinned against the light. It is this which gives force to his utterances, and to those of the prophets after him. Their teaching was resented, not because it was novel and heretical, but because every one knew in his heart that it was true. They

spoke for a moral law which had long been recognized as the law of God.

The prophets, then, took their stand on principles which no one questioned. We have no means of knowing to what extent and in what manner these principles had been formulated, but their nature was well understood, and the prophets only insisted that this divine law should be obeyed. In so far as they advanced on previous ideas, it seems to have been in two directions. On the one hand they perceived, more clearly than those before them, that the moral demands were paramount. For the people at large the divine law included all things associated with religion,—the sacrifices, the temple ordinances, the keeping of the Sabbath and the holy days, the dietary rules. The prophets also held these to be obligatory. Isaiah condemns the externalism of the ordinary worship, but never denies its value. He rests his confidence on the sure corner-stone of God's presence with his people on Zion. One of the chief interests of the prophets was to centralise the traditional worship and so ensure its purity. Yet they insist that the ritual must be kept in a secondary place. The idea of holiness had hitherto been connected with sacred objects and ceremonies, but the prophets transferred it to the moral sphere. The grand attribute of God was his righteousness, and all that was done righteously bore the divine stamp, and was holy. This, perhaps, was the great achievement of the prophets,—that they attached to the moral law those conceptions of the divine which had hitherto been associated with material things. On the other hand, the prophets advanced on the static idea of God's law. It had been assumed that he had spoken to men in the past, imposing a fixed code, after the manner of a law-giver. For the prophets he was the living God, ever ruling and directing his people. The very function of the prophets was to convey the present will of God. They were the spokesmen of God, declaring his will as it applied now, in the affairs of men

and nations. The law was the same as from the beginning, but it was an active power, relating itself in new forms to present needs.)

It was the limitation of the prophets that they never escaped from the idea of the moral law as statutory. God was the supreme King, whose dictates must be accepted as final. He was righteous, and all that he demanded must be right, but men were to act in this way because he had so ordained. A law was imposed on them, and their part was simply to obey it. The prophets, it may be said, were subject to a fallacy which has confused all thinking to this day. "Law," in the strict sense, is a political word, and in giving it a wider application we forget too easily, and often with serious consequences, that we are speaking metaphorically. Perhaps there was nothing which so retarded the advance of science as the use of the term "laws of nature." As a result, nature was conceived as a vast inert mass, without form or quality, on which certain laws had been forcibly imposed; and the laws were examined and defined, almost without reference to the things. Now we are learning that what we called laws are necessities inherent in the things themselves. The thing and its mode of action are one and the same. This must also be true, in the last resort, of what we call the divine law. It is not something which God has enacted, and which men must accept, under penalties, as their rule of conduct. It is one with the nature of God, and men possess it only in so far as it becomes one with their nature. Is a thing right because God wills it, or does he will it because it is right? This is a problem which has perplexed many thinkers, among them St. Paul, who cannot admit that God is under constraint, and yet refuses to believe that even God, by an act of sovereign will, can make wrong right. The dilemma springs, however, from the old conception of law as statutory. In some memorable passages the prophets appear to rise for a moment above this conception, as in Jere-

miah's forecast of the new covenant. Yet in the main the effect of prophecy was to reinforce the idea of a supreme ruler imposing his law. Even Micah, when he speaks of the three great duties which God requires, has the idea of law in his mind. These are the things commanded by God. All the others are comprised in them, and mean nothing apart from them; but these are the duties which God has imposed on men. It was by no misunderstanding that the prophetic religion took its final shape as the Law.

Here we may discern the radical difference between the prophets and Jesus. In many ways his teaching can fairly be described as a reversion to that of the prophets. Like them he declares that the moral law is paramount, at the same time advancing the further step of detaching it altogether from mere ceremonial. He saw nothing in the Temple but a survival; he thought of the Sabbath as made for man; in the Pharisaic concern with ritual he found only a sophistry which obscured the true issues of religion. Like the prophets, too, he laid emphasis on the present will of God, who is not the God of the dead but of the living. Men are to know what he requires of them now, and must apply his demands in their daily action and in all their relations to their fellow-men. In the main, too, Jesus is at one with the prophets as to the manner of conduct which is in accordance with God's law. He implicitly accepts as his own that summary of man's duty which is offered by Micah. While developing the ideas of justice and mercy to far deeper issues, he rests his ethic on that of the prophets, and in a real sense he was one of them. More than once he thus describes himself in so many words.

Yet in one respect his teaching was new, and grew out of a new root. His interest was not in what God had commanded, but in what God is, in his essential nature. The divine will, as he knew it, was one of justice, goodness, love. He called on men to share

in that divine will, so that it would possess them, and control them at all times without any conscious effort. The whole aim of Jesus was to bring men into such a relation to God that they would surrender themselves to his will, and allow it to work in them freely. With him, therefore, all thought of a law, to which men painfully submit themselves, falls out of sight. As children of God they obey him gladly and unconsciously, almost without their knowing.

This new conception finds expression in the Sermon on the Mount,—all the more pointedly since the Christian message is for Matthew the new law over against the law of Moses. In his effort to state this new law in Jesus' own words he shows unwittingly that it is not a law at all. What Jesus insists on is the nature, the disposition which must grow up in men and take the place of law. They are to be perfect like the heavenly Father, having in them the will which is pure from hate and self-seeking and all low desire. Their action will have moral value only as it is the natural outcome of this will of God which has taken full possession of them. Thus the purpose of Jesus was not to impose a new law but to make new men. When he speaks of God's commandments he is only using the current religious language. God commands certain things in the sense that they belong to his nature, and those who are conformed to the nature of God will act as he does. The moral life does not consist in obedience to God's law, but in repeating, on the little scale, what God is on the great one.

The idea of law is only a metaphor which we apply vaguely to all kinds of natural and moral necessities. We cannot dispense with the metaphor, and men of science continue to speak of the law of gravitation, the

laws of heat and sound and motion, even when they aim at demonstrating that these are not laws. In the same way we shall always speak of the moral law, and the term is helpful and necessary. Yet from the Christian point of view it is often misleading. When taken quite literally, as it was, for instance, by the Puritans, it tends to produce a type of character which is definitely non-Christian. A man sets himself to live, like Milton, "as ever in his great Task-master's eye." He acts under a constant sense of compulsion, and his moral life is hard and external. One feels, in intercourse with him, that the man's righteousness is something different from the man himself. The Christian ideal is a life which is not regulated by law, but flows spontaneously out of the new will. Through fellowship with God the man has been morally conformed to God, and acts instinctively according to the higher will. It has to be admitted that no one has yet come any where near this Christian ideal, and yet in minor ways we can see it in process of fulfillment. May we not conceive of a time when the will in its whole extent will be transformed, as it now is very partially? There will be no thought of a divine law but only of a divine nature, in which we participate as children of God. This was the ideal of Jesus, and we cannot hope that it will ever on this earth be realized. We must needs content ourselves with the conception of a moral law, which we cannot, with our best efforts, obey. Yet it was not in terms of law that Jesus thought of the will of God. He rose, in this respect, above the prophetic teaching, and sought to create in men a new kind of life, in which they would serve God because they shared in his moral nature.

The Conception of History in the Prophets and Jesus

PAUL S. MINEAR

THIS SYMPOSIUM seeks a deeper understanding of the prophets and Jesus by means of comparative study. My assignment is to discuss their viewpoint with regard to the historical process. Many such comparative analyses proceed upon five assumptions: (1) that the central and definitive factor of religion lies in the area of beliefs; (2) that each of these beliefs may be reduced without difficulty to an abstract concept which may be defined with precision; (3) that the total configuration of ideas may be dissolved and the component elements be withdrawn from the complex; (4) that the growth and relative validity of each separate concept may be determined by genetic study; and (5) that the superiority of Jesus, if there be such, must be found by locating the unique ideas which he held. For some purposes these assumptions may be valid, but they do not help us enter into the real world of the prophets and Jesus. They may help us dissect the idea of the kingdom, but they do not help us share the consciousness of the kingdom which dominated the lives of the prophets and Jesus.

Taking these five assumptions in reverse order, let us suggest the main objections to them. (5) Never has the Christian church held that the authority of Jesus rests upon the novel ideas which he espoused. Such was not the basis of his call to discipleship, nor was it the substance of the preaching of Peter or Paul. (4) Never did the prophets or Jesus test the origin of their message by the process of objective study. Their word came from God and was intended for immediate acceptance by men. In most cases, their theological ideas coincided with those of the false prophets; their message was unique in its origin and impact, not in

the discovery of new ideas. (3) Nor is the skeleton of Biblical thought such that we are able to dissect it one bone at a time, analyzing the genesis and growth of that bone. To separate the concept of God from the immediate encounter with God is to falsify both. It is *God* and not the *idea* of God who acts in history and who through such activity speaks to the prophets. (2) Hence, to consider any aspect of prophetic experience as an abstract concept is to blind ourselves to the concrete experience from which thought proceeded. (1) Of course, the prophets held ideas, as all men must. And these ideas are susceptible to genetic study. But the distinguishing mark of Biblical faith is its character as history and as revelation. God speaks; He acts. The prophet hears; he sees. To understand the prophet we need to stand with him at his "point of standing."

Our purpose, therefore, is to enter into the historical consciousness of the prophets and Jesus. We will proceed by outlining three areas: the distinctive historical consciousness that pervades the entire Bible, the more specific time-consciousness that underlies Biblical eschatology, the points at which Jesus' outlook differed from that of the prophets.

I. HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE BIBLE

For men of the Bible, *all history is a continuing encounter between men and God*, a series of eventful meetings between Persons, "I and Thou." Each successive meeting is viewed from within the web of personal relations by man as a participant. It is not viewed from outside by man as a spectator, viewing impersonally the course

of external events. At every moment, God confronts man directly and personally. As Creator, Sustainer and Judge, He initiates activity that determines the situation within which man's life is set. And that situation encompasses man's total existence; not simply his thought or his feeling, not simply his inner consciousness or his external behavior, but his whole life. It involves him not as an isolated individual but as a member of a living community, a community on whose destiny his own future hangs.

To men of the Bible, then, history is not a series of past events to be reviewed reflectively and retrospectively, "the rolling up of the carpet after the procession has passed." Rather history is a situation in which one participates here and now, a situation in which the divine purpose is revealed and obedience is demanded. This decision assumes and assures man's freedom and responsibility. But man always acts within the context of divine will. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it." Thus *history is a succession of situations compelling human decision.*

Man's decision may represent a measure of loyalty to God's will. On the other hand, it indicates rebellion against God; it demonstrates the reality of invisible forces diverting him from full obedience to his Creator. Man is inevitably involved in a continuing dramatic conflict between personal forces that contend for domination over his destiny. As these forces are invisible and heavenly in character, the course of earthly struggle is paralleled by a continuing war in heaven. *History is continuing conflict between God and all that opposes him.*

The outcome of human life depends upon the resolution of this conflict. And such resolution demands decision now. Both the prophets and Jesus stress the present moment in which destiny is being determined, the moment in which man decides for or against God. The memory of previous events may stretch back to the beginnings of creation; the hope for the future may envisage

the ultimate end of all history; but both memory and anticipation are focussed upon this present moment. Historians tell stories of past events; seers predict the coming of judgment and redemption; but both historians and prophets are concerned with the Word of the Lord for *us, now, here*. The more acute the consciousness of the past, the more imperative the need for present action. The more certain impending judgment, the more tension between God and present evil. Consciousness of historical conflict is concentrated in the immediate personal situation of the present moment. *History is the continual impact of past and future upon the present.*

The understanding of the present moment, however, is not available by a process of objective analysis of the external fortunes of the community. Men as men, in and by themselves, can never discover the purpose of God; they can never, by applying human wisdom, distinguish the promptings of God from the lures of the devil. The meaning of events is never obvious: the Egyptians understood not the meaning of the Red Sea, nor did the Canaanites comprehend the power behind the tribes of occupation. Medes and Persians unwittingly participated in God's plans. Opponents of Jesus were blind to the signs of the times. The inner meaning of the past comes to men only through revelation. Likewise, the true shape of things to come is not open to political seer or court chronicler. Apart from the word of the Lord, false expectation is bound to lead men astray. Obedience to God presupposes knowledge of his will, and such knowledge must come from Him alone. Thus historical consciousness is bound up with a lively sense of dependence upon revelation, revelation that gives the clue to the meaning of past, present and future. *History is thus continuing revelation of the hidden purpose of God.*

Such revelation the Jewish people have received. The clue to history is the purpose of God. He is Alpha and Omega. He

was the first historical actor in the first historical event, the Creation. His final action, wherein his purpose is consummated, will mark the end of history. Between beginning and end, life is characterized by rebellion and conflict. So confusing is the interplay of opposing forces that God's activity is hidden. Yet it is always the salient factor in every situation. And it may be detected by those chosen by God. To Israel, He has revealed his will in the strategic events of Exodus and settlement in the Promised Land. In those events, he has chosen Israel as his son to fulfill a special role as revealer and participant in his plan. In those events, he has inaugurated a covenant, which continues to mediate his commands and promises to his people. Yet the fulfillment of the covenant is ever incomplete, frustrated by stubbornness and apostasy. Only the contemporary disclosure of future events can give adequate support to the covenant. *History is thus the process of frustration and fulfillment of God's covenant.*

Historical consciousness in the Bible necessitated the work of revealers, who would disclose the immediate purpose of God. Both prophets and Jesus served in this role. Historical consciousness also required the work of predictors, who could answer the question "What time is it?" This, too, was the work of the prophets and Jesus. We move, then, to the second area of study.

II. THE TIME-CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE PROPHETS AND JESUS.

The unique historical consciousness in the Bible is inseparable from a unique time-consciousness. For time is conceived primarily as a category of history and not of nature. Clock-time and calendar-time are natural categories; they are fixed, arbitrary, absolute measurements of the movements of the solar system. But historical time is relative and variable; it measures movement in society. In the Bible, this relativity is conceived in three ways. (1) Time is relative to

a particular societal unit, expressing the immediate awareness of the past, present and future of that unit. Time involves destiny, not of all men in general, but of this community in particular. (2) As destiny is everywhere assumed to be dependent upon divine activity, time is relative to the dynamic purpose of the Creator; time marks the successive stages in the maturing of his intention. (3) The destiny which is dependent upon the divine will is at every moment threatened by an omni-present Adversary. The fulfillment of history awaits the restoration of divine sovereignty through the suppression of this rebellion. Time is relative to the rhythm of this struggle.

Unlike calendar-time, historical time varies in tempo. It tarries and it hurries. Unlike calendar-time, historical time varies in scope. Calendar-time is a single, all-inclusive sequence, into which all events must be fitted. The sequence is irreversible and unrepeatable. Historical time consists of multiple sequences. Each created being responds to a definite intention of the Creator and runs a separate course from inception through conflict to fulfillment. Each creature has his own time.

No limit is conceivable to calendar-time; it consists of endless, quantitative duration. But, to men of the Bible, historical time has a beginning and an end; it consists of qualitative development. There is a first and a last day. "The purpose of God frames time. . . . Time becomes an instrument in the hands of God: it becomes eschatological" (Richard Kroner). God's acts are not forced to conform to a previously ordained schedule of solar aeons; rather, distinctions of time rise from the need for distinguishing the order of divine acts.

Calendar-time is impersonal and external; historical time is internal. It is always *our* time, a dimension of our lives. Duration is simply "the time of our lives." We always measure such time by looking backward and forward from the present moment. My his-

tory is my autobiography; and as long as it is mine, it is always concerned with the present and is always incomplete. I may relate the story of my life to the framework of days and years, but my existence transcends those impersonal calipers.

Biblical apprehensions of time are particularly evident in the New Testament in the use of *kairos* as distinct from *chronos*. *Chronos* refers to the unvarying progression of hours and days; *kairos* refers to the religiously decisive time which is given and ordained by God, a Moment which is decisive in the determination of destiny. Every man has his *kairos* from God, which may be accepted or ignored, but only with the most serious consequences. Every city and nation as well has its *kairos*. Jerusalem missed the *kairos* of its visitation and is destined for catastrophe. The *kairos* of the Jews differs from that of the Gentiles. *Kairos* is thus inherently an eschatological concept, implicit in all Jewish thought.

The *kairos* is a Moment of "filled time" in which the past is fulfilled. Man stands at the point of decision and transition. He stands at a point toward which previous experience has been tending. He has already received the covenant; that covenant reveals his own stubbornness and blindness and at the same time God's faithfulness through the preceding years. In this Moment man experiences guilt and suffering. The past is fulfilled in Judgment upon sin, in renewed demand for loyalty, and in a new stage of the struggle with evil. This element of fulfillment is present in both the prophets and Jesus.

Kairos is also a Moment of anticipated future fulfillment. This, too, is found in both the prophets and Jesus. None of them assumes that the Day of the Lord has come, that the kingdom has been established. Yet for all of them that event is considered very near; and for all of them it is an event which enters into the present moment and confronts men as a force the reality of which cannot be doubted. For all of them it is

God who determines the date of this coming event, and he can vary the schedule of expected happenings. For all it may be "two minutes till twelve" but the calculation is in terms of divine purpose and not in terms of Greenwich clocks. For men exact prediction is in fact impossible, but in faith they receive an assurance of the nearness of the End and detect its advance signs. As Bultmann writes: "The kingdom of God is a power which, although it is entirely future, wholly determines the present." That statement I find to be true for the prophets as well as for Jesus.

Thus in the present Moment all of one's past is concentrated—"The time is fulfilled"—and all future destiny is at stake—"The kingdom of God is at hand." The *kairos* is the bridge thrown across the chasm that separates past from future, frustration from fulfillment. Those who reject their *kairos* find no bridge. Those who accept it stand on the road, their faces set toward God's future. To them God's judgment and His promise are the real ground of choice. God's sovereignty becomes clear and His intention becomes irresistible. In the ordering of life according to His purpose, man testifies to the End of history which is *always at hand but never completely realized*.

Both the prophets and Jesus insisted that men must understand the signs of this *kairos*. And this comprehension is not a matter of *speculation* but of *revelation*. Thought concerning forthcoming events did not focus upon the day and the hour but upon the new threat of judgment and the new promise of help. This observation suggests why Biblical men were not greatly disturbed by the mistaken predictions of their predecessors. Speculation is mistaken if it miss the precise day, but revelation depends for its validity upon other factors than chronological accuracy. The truth of revelation depends upon whether it was actually God who spoke, whether it was actually his will which confronted human choices, whether his servants were faithful to their call. This sug-

was the first historical actor in the first historical event, the Creation. His final action, wherein his purpose is consummated, will mark the end of history. Between beginning and end, life is characterized by rebellion and conflict. So confusing is the interplay of opposing forces that God's activity is hidden. Yet it is always the salient factor in every situation. And it may be detected by those chosen by God. To Israel, He has revealed his will in the strategic events of Exodus and settlement in the Promised Land. In those events, he has chosen Israel as his son to fulfill a special role as revealer and participant in his plan. In those events, he has inaugurated a covenant, which continues to mediate his commands and promises to his people. Yet the fulfillment of the covenant is ever incomplete, frustrated by stubbornness and apostasy. Only the contemporary disclosure of future events can give adequate support to the covenant. *History is thus the process of frustration and fulfillment of God's covenant.*

Historical consciousness in the Bible necessitated the work of revealers, who would disclose the immediate purpose of God. Both prophets and Jesus served in this role. Historical consciousness also required the work of predictors, who could answer the question "What time is it?" This, too, was the work of the prophets and Jesus. We move, then, to the second area of study.

II. THE TIME-CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE PROPHETS AND JESUS.

The unique historical consciousness in the Bible is inseparable from a unique time-consciousness. For time is conceived primarily as a category of history and not of nature. Clock-time and calendar-time are natural categories; they are fixed, arbitrary, absolute measurements of the movements of the solar system. But historical time is relative and variable; it measures movement in society. In the Bible, this relativity is conceived in three ways. (1) Time is relative to

a particular societal unit, expressing the immediate awareness of the past, present and future of that unit. Time involves destiny, not of all men in general, but of this community in particular. (2) As destiny is everywhere assumed to be dependent upon divine activity, time is relative to the dynamic purpose of the Creator; time marks the successive stages in the maturing of his intention. (3) The destiny which is dependent upon the divine will is at every moment threatened by an omni-present Adversary. The fulfillment of history awaits the restoration of divine sovereignty through the suppression of this rebellion. Time is relative to the rhythm of this struggle.

Unlike calendar-time, historical time varies in tempo. It tarries and it hurries. Unlike calendar-time, historical time varies in scope. Calendar-time is a single, all-inclusive sequence, into which all events must be fitted. The sequence is irreversible and unrepeatable. Historical time consists of multiple sequences. Each created being responds to a definite intention of the Creator and runs a separate course from inception through conflict to fulfillment. Each creature has his own time.

No limit is conceivable to calendar-time; it consists of endless, quantitative duration. But, to men of the Bible, historical time has a beginning and an end; it consists of qualitative development. There is a first and a last day. "The purpose of God frames time. . . . Time becomes an instrument in the hands of God: it becomes eschatological" (Richard Kroner). God's acts are not forced to conform to a previously ordained schedule of solar aeons; rather, distinctions of time rise from the need for distinguishing the order of divine acts.

Calendar-time is impersonal and external; historical time is internal. It is always *our* time, a dimension of our lives. Duration is simply "the time of our lives." We always measure such time by looking backward and forward from the present moment. My his-

tory is my autobiography; and as long as it is mine, it is always concerned with the present and is always incomplete. I may relate the story of my life to the framework of days and years, but my existence transcends those impersonal calipers.

Biblical apprehensions of time are particularly evident in the New Testament in the use of *kairos* as distinct from *chronos*. *Chronos* refers to the unvarying progression of hours and days; *kairos* refers to the religiously decisive time which is given and ordained by God, a Moment which is decisive in the determination of destiny. Every man has his *kairos* from God, which may be accepted or ignored, but only with the most serious consequences. Every city and nation as well has its *kairos*. Jerusalem missed the *kairos* of its visitation and is destined for catastrophe. The *kairos* of the Jews differs from that of the Gentiles. *Kairos* is thus inherently an eschatological concept, implicit in all Jewish thought.

The *kairos* is a Moment of "filled time" in which the past is fulfilled. Man stands at the point of decision and transition. He stands at a point toward which previous experience has been tending. He has already received the covenant; that covenant reveals his own stubbornness and blindness and at the same time God's faithfulness through the preceding years. In this Moment man experiences guilt and suffering. The past is fulfilled in Judgment upon sin, in renewed demand for loyalty, and in a new stage of the struggle with evil. This element of fulfillment is present in both the prophets and Jesus.

Kairos is also a Moment of anticipated future fulfillment. This, too, is found in both the prophets and Jesus. None of them assumes that the Day of the Lord has come, that the kingdom has been established. Yet for all of them that event is considered very near; and for all of them it is an event which enters into the present moment and confronts men as a force the reality of which cannot be doubted. For all of them it is

God who determines the date of this coming event, and he can vary the schedule of expected happenings. For all it may be "two minutes till twelve" but the calculation is in terms of divine purpose and not in terms of Greenwich clocks. For men exact prediction is in fact impossible, but in faith they receive an assurance of the nearness of the End and detect its advance signs. As Bultmann writes: "The kingdom of God is a power which, although it is entirely future, wholly determines the present." That statement I find to be true for the prophets as well as for Jesus.

Thus in the present Moment all of one's past is concentrated—"The time is fulfilled"—and all future destiny is at stake—"The kingdom of God is at hand." The *kairos* is the bridge thrown across the chasm that separates past from future, frustration from fulfillment. Those who reject their *kairos* find no bridge. Those who accept it stand on the road, their faces set toward God's future. To them God's judgment and His promise are the real ground of choice. God's sovereignty becomes clear and His intention becomes irresistible. In the ordering of life according to His purpose, man testifies to the End of history which is *always at hand but never completely realized*.

Both the prophets and Jesus insisted that men must understand the signs of this *kairos*. And this comprehension is not a matter of *speculation* but of *revelation*. Thought concerning forthcoming events did not focus upon the day and the hour but upon the new threat of judgment and the new promise of help. This observation suggests why Biblical men were not greatly disturbed by the mistaken predictions of their predecessors. Speculation is mistaken if it miss the precise day, but revelation depends for its validity upon other factors than chronological accuracy. The truth of revelation depends upon whether it was actually God who spoke, whether it was actually his will which confronted human choices, whether his servants were faithful to their call. This sug-

was the first historical actor in the first historical event, the Creation. His final action, wherein his purpose is consummated, will mark the end of history. Between beginning and end, life is characterized by rebellion and conflict. So confusing is the interplay of opposing forces that God's activity is hidden. Yet it is always the salient factor in every situation. And it may be detected by those chosen by God. To Israel, He has revealed his will in the strategic events of Exodus and settlement in the Promised Land. In those events, he has chosen Israel as his son to fulfill a special role as revealer and participant in his plan. In those events, he has inaugurated a covenant, which continues to mediate his commands and promises to his people. Yet the fulfillment of the covenant is ever incomplete, frustrated by stubbornness and apostasy. Only the contemporary disclosure of future events can give adequate support to the covenant. *History is thus the process of frustration and fulfillment of God's covenant.*

Historical consciousness in the Bible necessitated the work of revealers, who would disclose the immediate purpose of God. Both prophets and Jesus served in this role. Historical consciousness also required the work of predictors, who could answer the question "What time is it?" This, too, was the work of the prophets and Jesus. We move, then, to the second area of study.

II. THE TIME-CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE PROPHETS AND JESUS.

The unique historical consciousness in the Bible is inseparable from a unique time-consciousness. For time is conceived primarily as a category of history and not of nature. Clock-time and calendar-time are natural categories; they are fixed, arbitrary, absolute measurements of the movements of the solar system. But historical time is relative and variable; it measures movement in society. In the Bible, this relativity is conceived in three ways. (1) Time is relative to

a particular societal unit, expressing the immediate awareness of the past, present and future of that unit. Time involves destiny, not of all men in general, but of this community in particular. (2) As destiny is everywhere assumed to be dependent upon divine activity, time is relative to the dynamic purpose of the Creator; time marks the successive stages in the maturing of his intention. (3) The destiny which is dependent upon the divine will is at every moment threatened by an omni-present Adversary. The fulfillment of history awaits the restoration of divine sovereignty through the suppression of this rebellion. Time is relative to the rhythm of this struggle.

Unlike calendar-time, historical time varies in tempo. It tarries and it hurries. Unlike calendar-time, historical time varies in scope. Calendar-time is a single, all-inclusive sequence, into which all events must be fitted. The sequence is irreversible and unrepeatable. Historical time consists of multiple sequences. Each created being responds to a definite intention of the Creator and runs a separate course from inception through conflict to fulfillment. Each creature has his own time.

No limit is conceivable to calendar-time; it consists of endless, quantitative duration. But, to men of the Bible, historical time has a beginning and an end; it consists of qualitative development. There is a first and a last day. "The purpose of God frames time. . . . Time becomes an instrument in the hands of God: it becomes eschatological" (Richard Kroner). God's acts are not forced to conform to a previously ordained schedule of solar aeons; rather, distinctions of time rise from the need for distinguishing the order of divine acts.

Calendar-time is impersonal and external; historical time is internal. It is always *our* time, a dimension of our lives. Duration is simply "the time of our lives." We always measure such time by looking backward and forward from the present moment. My his-

tory is my autobiography; and as long as it is mine, it is always concerned with the present and is always incomplete. I may relate the story of my life to the framework of days and years, but my existence transcends those impersonal calipers.

Biblical apprehensions of time are particularly evident in the New Testament in the use of *kairos* as distinct from *chronos*. *Chronos* refers to the unvarying progression of hours and days; *kairos* refers to the religiously decisive time which is given and ordained by God, a Moment which is decisive in the determination of destiny. Every man has his *kairos* from God, which may be accepted or ignored, but only with the most serious consequences. Every city and nation as well has its *kairos*. Jerusalem missed the *kairos* of its visitation and is destined for catastrophe. The *kairos* of the Jews differs from that of the Gentiles. *Kairos* is thus inherently an eschatological concept, implicit in all Jewish thought.

The *kairos* is a Moment of "filled time" in which the past is fulfilled. Man stands at the point of decision and transition. He stands at a point toward which previous experience has been tending. He has already received the covenant; that covenant reveals his own stubbornness and blindness and at the same time God's faithfulness through the preceding years. In this Moment man experiences guilt and suffering. The past is fulfilled in Judgment upon sin, in renewed demand for loyalty, and in a new stage of the struggle with evil. This element of fulfillment is present in both the prophets and Jesus.

Kairos is also a Moment of anticipated future fulfillment. This, too, is found in both the prophets and Jesus. None of them assumes that the Day of the Lord has come, that the kingdom has been established. Yet for all of them that event is considered very near; and for all of them it is an event which enters into the present moment and confronts men as a force the reality of which cannot be doubted. For all of them it is

God who determines the date of this coming event, and he can vary the schedule of expected happenings. For all it may be "two minutes till twelve" but the calculation is in terms of divine purpose and not in terms of Greenwich clocks. For men exact prediction is in fact impossible, but in faith they receive an assurance of the nearness of the End and detect its advance signs. As Bultmann writes: "The kingdom of God is a power which, although it is entirely future, wholly determines the present." That statement I find to be true for the prophets as well as for Jesus.

Thus in the present Moment all of one's past is concentrated—"The time is fulfilled"—and all future destiny is at stake—"The kingdom of God is at hand." The *kairos* is the bridge thrown across the chasm that separates past from future, frustration from fulfillment. Those who reject their *kairos* find no bridge. Those who accept it stand on the road, their faces set toward God's future. To them God's judgment and His promise are the real ground of choice. God's sovereignty becomes clear and His intention becomes irresistible. In the ordering of life according to His purpose, man testifies to the End of history which is *always at hand but never completely realized*.

Both the prophets and Jesus insisted that men must understand the signs of this *kairos*. And this comprehension is not a matter of *speculation* but of *revelation*. Thought concerning forthcoming events did not focus upon the day and the hour but upon the new threat of judgment and the new promise of help. This observation suggests why Biblical men were not greatly disturbed by the mistaken predictions of their predecessors. Speculation is mistaken if it miss the precise day, but revelation depends for its validity upon other factors than chronological accuracy. The truth of revelation depends upon whether it was actually God who spoke, whether it was actually his will which confronted human choices, whether his servants were faithful to their call. This sug-

gests too why early Christianity survived the collapse of apocalyptic expectations. Faith survived the frustration of hope not because hope was secondary but because hope was grounded in revelation and not in speculation.

So far, it seems to me we have been dealing with a perspective which Jesus shared with the prophets. We raise the question, then, wherein lay the contrasts?

III. DIFFERENCES IN JESUS' OUTLOOK.

It is difficult to avoid the danger of reading one's own special biases into an analysis of the contrasts between Jesus and the prophets. Too often we desire to prove the New Testament superior to the Old by demonstrating the superior truth of the ideas of Jesus. Yet we do not overcome subjective tendencies by denying the existence of any difference whatsoever. Those who take historical relativism seriously will not expect to find final truth in conceptual form in either the prophets or Jesus. Nor will we expect to find identity of thought. For Jesus lived in a different age and culture. His heritage was richer, more complex. The crucial environmental problems were different. He shared not only the prophetic tradition, but the legal, priestly, wisdom and pietistic traditions as well. He had been influenced by apocalypticism, with its transfer of ideas from many diverse sources. Compared to the time of the prophets, the political situation had altered. The range of control by Jewish leaders had narrowed. The centuries of suffering had left their searing imprint. Jesus addressed a different economic and social class than did the prophets.

The most significant changes in historical outlook we shall outline under two heads:

A. *There are differences in the content of his ideas and thought-patterns.* There is a darker pessimism concerning the efficacy of human action in economic and political redress. The power of evil is seen in sharper terms and is described in a developed de-

monology. Satan's independence and power are more dominant in the present age and God's sovereign will is more completely hidden and unfulfilled. Consequently, the earth and conditions of life will be transformed more radically than in prophetic expectation. The kingdom is conceived in more exalted transcendentalism; the future age is "wholly-other" than this age. Because the canyon between the ages is deeper and wider, the process of transition becomes more catastrophic in character. The cosmic and historical repercussions of judgment are more pronounced. The *End* is now conceived in more truly universal, absolute and final terms. It becomes the solution to the problem not of one age or nation, but of all ages and nations, it becomes the end of all history as such. Life in the kingdom is described not in positive statements about earthly enjoyment but in negative statements to draw the sharp antithesis between the kingdom and everything characteristic of the frustrations of this age. The function of myth becomes more pronounced. The problem of history becomes almost exclusively the problem of eschatology, and the problem of eschatology (i. e., the coming of an absolute end of history) becomes the problem of the revealed assurance of the irresistible sovereignty of God and of his faithfulness to his covenant. These are important changes, yet I think more important ones may be found in a second area.

B. *Jesus holds a different place in the historical fulfillment of God's purposes.* The contrast here is in the area not of human ideas but of divine activity. The question is not what Jesus thought about the kingdom but what God did through him to mediate the kingdom to men. For Christians have always believed that in his ministry and death the kingdom was actually intruding upon history. Jesus seems to have been conscious that a new stage of history was being inaugurated, that preparation and prediction had now been fulfilled. He sensed an authority similar in type to the authority

of the prophets, yet an authority that compelled him to walk a different road. He and his disciples saw things which "prophets had long hoped to see"; they received power over Satan, healing and forgiving power, which the prophets had not exercised. Jesus exerted the right to call disciples and form about himself the covenant community. His "come unto me all ye" . . . and his "No one knoweth the Father save the Son . . ." if authentic, are claims which the prophets did not make. Perhaps he spoke of a covenant being formed between God and men through his own suffering. Perhaps he claimed to be Son of Man. His conscious claims are not so significant as his actual function in history as "a prophet and more

than a prophet," as revealer, forgiver, mediator, Messiah. His preeminence consists not in superiority of human merit or wisdom but in the work to which God assigned him. Jesus' view of history was different from that of the prophets because he stood at a different point in history and was given a different mission. This mission was a true fulfillment of the prophets, binding him to their succession; but this mission also initiated a new impetus, a new age, a new covenant . . .

"The law and the prophets were until John . . .

Since then the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached."

An Old Testament Prophecy and Some New Testament Miracle Stories

C. P. COFFIN

THE OLD TESTAMENT passage is in Isaiah, Chapter 35, verses 3 to 6. Let me quote the sonorous English of the King James version:

Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong fear not: behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompence; he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert.

To the synagogue-going people at the beginning of the present era this passage must have been quite as familiar as it is to us. Its promise that their God should come and save them, its forecast of the ideal conditions that should then prevail, had been the cherished possession of their fathers for many generations; its conceptions and its language formed an important part of the national heritage. The hope and the expectation that it held forth helped the chosen people to interpret their own history and did much toward molding their thoughts, their beliefs and their outlook on the future.

Thus, by the middle of the first century, while the gospel tradition had been most actively developing and taking definitive form, when the Greek translation of the Old Testament scriptures seems to have been even more familiarly quoted than the original, the direct influence of the LXX, of its thought, of its very language, clearly appears in the then crystallizing evangelic tradition.

The word "pericope," so often used in the work of New Testament critics, seems commonly if not always to bear the sense of a

more or less brief account of an episode, or report of a saying, that is presumed to have circulated, unattached, during the period of oral tradition and development of the material that was later put together to make up the gospel narratives. From its derivation the word seems rather to mean something *cut around*, what we would call an excerpt or clipping from some more extended work already in writing, as a lection for use in a church service. Of a "pericope" in this sense we could perhaps find no better example than the brief passage taken from Isaiah, cited above. There seems little reason to doubt that it was frequently read with its context publicly in the Jewish synagogue, whether in the original or in translation, or that it was very likely one of the favorite prophetic messages used by the Master, perhaps many times repeated by him in his peripatetic teaching, in which the doctrine of the approaching Kingdom of God held a place of prime interest and importance. Among his early hearers it was thus in a fair way to become a "pericope" in the adapted sense of the word, a brief account or report, an epitome of the prophetic promise, circulating by itself, passing orally from man to man, subject to all the little slips of incomplete or inaccurate memory, to suggestibility growing out of the association of ideas, and to the common human tendency to re-tell a story with elaborations and exaggerations; subject, too, to the not uncommon tendency to transform a wish, a hope, an expectation into a conviction of its actual accomplishment.

Many examples in the synoptic gospels of such phenomena will be recalled, and one of the most obvious examples may be found in the numerous stories of the cure of deaf-

ness, dumbness, blindness and lameness, those ailments the relief of which was particularly visioned by the prophet.

Consider first the two stories recounted in Mark 7, 31-36 and Mark 8, 22-26. They are in close though not in immediate juxtaposition and occur in that block of Mark which is not used by Luke. One is about an individual that was deaf and dumb, the other about a man who was blind. As stories they are as near alike as a pair of twins. The locality is rather vaguely described in the first, somewhere to the east of the sea of Galilee; in the second it is stated to be Bethsaida. If Bethsaida Julias is meant, the placement is at least roughly the same.

In the stories proper, except for the difference in troubles, there is almost complete literal identity:

And they bring unto him one that was deaf
and had an impediment in his speech

and they beseech him to put his hand upon
him

and he took him aside from the multitude

(Jesus) put his fingers into his ears
and spit and touched his tongue

(Jesus) looking up to heaven sighed
and saith unto him Ephphatha, Be opened

his ears were opened and the string of his
tongue was loosed and he spake plain

And he charged them that they should tell
no man

And they bring unto him a blind man

and besought him to touch him
he took the blind man by the hand

and led him out of the town

spit on his eyes and put his hands upon him

(the man) looked up

and said I see men as trees walking

put his hand again upon his eyes and made

him look up

and he was restored

and saw every man clearly

And he sent him away to his house saying
Go not into the town
(nor tell it to any in the town)

To these likenesses of content might be added certain likenesses of omission; for here we find no hint of demonic possession that so frequently appears elsewhere, no "teaching matter" such as is attached to many of the cure stories.

Identity of form is abundantly evident: but still more important than that is essential identity of substance. Yet these two stories are not doublets. Whatever may have been their history during the period of their oral transmission they are now distinct entities, each complete in itself: and such they no doubt were when Mark or his predecessor picked them up and committed them to writing, though in their present state they probably display some characteristics of Mark's individual work,—*"ephphatha"* and its translation, the reference to the return from Tyre and Sidon, the injunction to keep the matter secret.

Nevertheless the story of the deaf and dumb man and the story of the blind man, though now divided as if by fission, yield evidence that they are genetically related, each descended straight from an ancestral story which incorporated in a single account what now appears in the two separated accounts. In other words, someone told that story in two different ways, at one time recalling the deaf-and-dumb factor, at another the blind factor, but otherwise essentially to the same effect. And for this conclusion further evidence can be adduced.

For Matthew was acquainted with just such a compendious story and relates it in his Chapter 15, 29-31. Like Mark, he

makes it follow the return from Tyre and Sidon to the sea of Galilee:

And great multitudes came unto him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet; and he healed them; insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak,* the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see; and they glorified the God of Israel.

True, this account deals not with individual cures but with a mass cure, in this respect resembling Mark 7, 37:

He hath done all things well: he maketh both the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak,

both passages inevitably recalling the language of the prophet. True, too, that Matthew's account may omit mention of the deaf, just as Mark's two stories omit mention of the lame: but the deficiency is more than made up in Matthew 11, 4-5 (as well as in Luke 7, 18-22),

The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them.

Compare also the story in Matthew 15 quoted above with the story in Matthew 12, 22-23 of the possessed dumb and blind man brought to Jesus and healed, "insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw, and all the people were amazed and said, Is not this the son of David?"; and the story in Matthew 9, 32-33 of the (same?) dumb and possessed man who, when the devil was cast out, spake; "and the multitude marvelled, saying, It was never so seen in Israel." Recall further the epileptic boy of Mark 9, 17, brought because he had a dumb spirit; the paralyzed youth or man of Mark 2, 1-12 brought because he was unable to walk; the congenitally lame beggar of Luke, in Acts 3, 1-8, carried to the Temple gate,

*This reading is preferred by Wescott & Hort.

who at the behest of Peter in the name of Jesus leaps up and walks; and the blind beggar of Jericho in Mark 10: 46 and several parallels, wherein sight is restored.

With all these passages before us it is interesting to note that in the ten stories cited dumbness occurs five times, as does blindness; lameness three or four times; deafness at least three times; demonic possession twice, both times in connection with dumbness; and leprosy, maiming, epilepsy and paralysis are mentioned once each. A few parallels, presumable doublets and mass cures are omitted from the list.

Now, in the synoptic gospels there are only about twenty accounts of individual cures, covering in addition to the above such ailments as foul spirit, spirit of weakness, withered hand, dropsy, hemorrhage and so forth, besides a few not identifiably described. Demonic possession becomes frequent, especially so in parallels to and extensions of certain Markan accounts.

We might, I suppose, assume from all this that cures of dumbness, deafness, blindness and lameness were from two to five times as frequent as the healing of other kinds of disease. But is it not far more probable that the greater number of those particular stories is due to the fact that they, all so much alike in essential form and in essential matter, are all closely akin, all direct descendants of a prolific ancestor story that had the dominant characteristics of them all and that was itself the offspring of the hope-inspiring vision of the ancient Seer?

So far we have been using our English Bible. But additional evidence of the intimate relation between the Old Testament passage and the New Testament passages here considered, that does not come out in the King James translation, emerges from a verbal comparison of the Greek of the New Testament with the Greek of the LXX.

Thus: *mogilalos*, Isaiah's word for dumb, or hardly speaking, is here an *hapax lego-*

menon in the LXX: Mark in Chapter 7 uses the same word in the same sense, here an *hapax* in the New Testament. And in Chapter 9,—the story of the epileptic boy,—as well as in Chapter 7, he uses *alalos*, not speaking, dumb.

In Isaiah *kōphos* means deaf or dull of hearing, and in Mark 7 the word appears with the same meaning.

But while Mark never uses *kōphos* to mean dull of speech or dumb, Matthew always uses it in that sense, with one exception and one possible exception, viz. in Matthew 11 where we read *kōphoi akouousin*, deaf hear; and in Matthew 15, where some authorities read *kōphous akountas*, while others, preferred by Wescott & Hort, read *kōphous lalountas*, dumb speak. In the first case Matthew, and in the second he, or more likely an amender, clearly reflects the phraseology of Isaiah in the translation of the Seventy. Luke also regularly writes *kōphos* for dumb, never, at least in the cure stories, for deaf, except in Luke 7, 22, where *kōphoi akouousin* exactly parallels Matthew 11, 5.

Isaiah and all three of the synoptists employ the word *tuphlos* for blind. *Ophthalmoi* is Isaiah's word for eyes, and it also occurs in the synoptics, though *ommata* sometimes takes its place. In Isaiah it was the *eyes* of the *blind* that should be opened, *anoichthesontai*: the ears of the deaf were to hear, *akousontai*. But in Mark's twin stories it is the *ears* of the *deaf* that are opened, *enoigesan*, a little slip of memory that supports the view that the two stories, now separate, were originally one.

Just here let us recall that the Greek words employed both in the LXX and in the gospels to indicate defects in speech, in hearing and in vision appear from their derivation to be not unqualified. Thus *kōphos* primarily means *dull*, as of a cutting tool. Figuratively it may mean either dull of hearing, deaf; dull of speech, dumb, like *mogilalos*; or even dull of comprehension,

stupid. Likewise *tuphlos* means smoky, *dim*, and when used of eyes, dim-sighted, like the old father in the play, sand-blind rather than stone blind, "seeing men as trees walking." These qualifications must have been in the mind of our authors, for in the immediate connection they introduce such expressions as *trane estai glōssa*, speech shall be made *distinct*; *elalei orthōs*, spake *correctly*; *eneblepen telaugōs*, saw *clearly*.

And what sonorous, mouth-filling examples of alliteration are presented in the Matthew passages: *chōlous, kullous, tuphlous, kōphous, heterous pollous*; *tuphlon, kōphon*; *tuphloi, chōloi, leproi, kōphoi, nekroi, ptōchoi*! Some of these words are in the LXX translation of Isaiah, but more are not; and the mixing in of the latter with the former may well be ascribed to the keen sense of the author for congruences of sound in spoken Greek. The alliterations, striking in the case endings, are even more striking in the reiterated kappa and chi sounds, the phis, the lambdas, the omegas. Similar likenesses are not, I am informed, encountered in the Hebrew or Aramaic equivalents.

The following observation may be purely fanciful, but on the other hand it may prove suggestive. For should I happen to be justified in arguing as I have had the termerity elsewhere to do that a story of an irate man in the Capernaum synagogue on a sabbath day became the ancestor of a family of variant descendents, then it would surely seem to be more than a mere coincidence that in one of those so-called sabbath-day stories there appears a man with a withered hand, in another a woman with a spirit of infirmity, in a third man with the dropsy, water in the wrong place, recalling to our minds, seemingly depending upon, the well remembered words of the prophet. Strengthen ye the weak hands, confirm the feeble knees,—even the *hudōr en te eremō*, water in the desert,—just as we find in that same prophecy the inspiration for our tales about cures of the deaf, dumb, lame and blind.

I do not delude myself into thinking that I have proved beyond a peradventure the correctness of my thesis. But from all the significant phenomena here gathered together and arranged in some sort of orderly fashion the conclusion seems naturally to follow that, even though no miraculous cures should ever have been performed, we have here an adequate explanation and *raison d'être* for the rise and circulation in early Christian circles of just such a family of marvel stories as the evangelists have collected and transcribed, based on the wishful expectation that a vision of the old and revered prophet would somehow, in due time, find literal fulfillment.

The appearance of John and of Jesus as teachers and reformers, their insistence from the very start that God's Kingdom was at hand, quite probably their repeated citation of the very passage from Isaiah that we have dwelt on, did quicken that expectation and could hardly have failed to rouse the belief that the ideal conditions of the kingdom were here and now immediately to be realized; an expectation and a belief that shortly (for the growth of the gospel tradition was rapid,) developed into a conviction that the scriptures must already have been literally fulfilled. How often do we read, "that the scripture might be fulfilled"! How frequently we are almost forced to conclude that what is so explained has, *ipso facto*, the explanation as the sole basis for its existence! By "frequently" do not misunderstand me to mean "always."

When writing as above that the growth of the gospel tradition was rapid, there is still in mind the practical certainty that this growth and development must have continued right up to the time when the tradition passed from the oral into the literary stage, and even beyond, as we can see from the variant synoptic exemplars. As to the date at which that point was reached we may never be quite certain, but perhaps the most of us can agree that it could hardly

have been much if any before 40 or 45 A. D. And during the period, long or short, following the death of Jesus yet preceding the opening of the literary stage, the development may well have been increasingly active and rapid. Much of what we find in even the earliest form of the literary tradition cannot have been an integral part of the oral tradition that was coming into existence during or shortly after the earthly life of the Master himself; and much, it seems, can hardly have developed until after the shift of the center of the Christian movement from predominantly Semitic-speaking to predominantly Greek-speaking peoples. It would require a volume rather than a brief monograph to list and discuss all the evidence for that conclusion. Among the comparatively late developments, however, may be placed such actual predication of miraculous cures as may be most reasonably accounted for on the theory that it is but an outgrowth of the wishful expectation of the fulfillment of ancient prophecy and the resulting conviction that the coming of the new Kingdom must already have brought its fulfillment.

Very many, probably most, of the intermediate steps in the developmental stage of the oral tradition would naturally drop out of sight, one after another, with the approaching completion of that period. And so it happens that the primary compilers of the gospel narrative picked up and preserved what was for the most part not the earliest but the latest oral versions of the traditional units, the forms that were current among believers, individuals and groups, at the time when our synoptists or their predecessors began to gather up, here and there, all the widely scattered and often diverse items that they found afloat, to jot them down, and, finally, to put them together in some sort of order and with such connective material as seemed to them necessary to make of the whole a fairly consecutive written narrative.

Teaching Religion in War Time

L. B. HAZZARD

RELIGION IS one of the subjects that lie outside the sphere of immediate usefulness in the war effort and for that reason the teacher of it faces in war time some problems that he would not ordinarily meet. One problem rises from the students, who are uncertain of the importance of this or any other liberal arts subject under present conditions. One rises from the administration which is under increasing pressure to confine academic offerings to those of demonstrable, immediate utility. And one rises from the constituency, where there is likely to develop tension between the Christian point of view and current mores, tension which is likely to make the teaching of religion seem not only useless, but positively subversive.

The task which is upon us then becomes one of (a) reorganizing courses so that the indispensability of the study of religion is apparent to students, administration, government agencies, and supporting constituency alike; (b) galvanizing somewhat lackadaisical and uncertain students into a real and vital interest in the message which religion has to teach; and (c) presenting the Christian message with no compromise, yet without being offensively doctrinaire, in a world in which the most earnest people differ and the implications of the gospel are far from clear. This paper will attempt to suggest two or three approaches which the writer has made in his endeavor to solve these problems.

1. *The attempt to use courses in religion to meet current needs and to demonstrate the indispensability of religion in the present situation.* I have become more and more convinced in recent years that most of the great ideas of our social order root back in

the Bible and that a knowledge of them as they appear there is essential to an understanding of contemporary society. I feel, furthermore, that the teaching of the social sciences and history which is done in our public schools almost entirely ignores the contribution of Judaeo-Christian culture to contemporary civilization, tracing our great ideas back so largely to Greek and Roman sources that young people get an entirely inadequate view of the contribution of religion to contemporary life.

With this in mind, I announced the basic course in "Biblical Appreciation," which is always offered for freshmen, as "Biblical Basis of Modern Culture." When I appeared before the class, I asked them to tell me what they considered the great ideas in modern society without which our world would be vastly different. After naming the mechanical and physical ideas and being reminded that there is another group of ideas, those that have to do with social and human values, the class named as the most important ideas in contemporary society; (1) democracy and freedom; (2) the idea of God; (3) the ideal of a unified world; (4) the idea of right and wrong. These ideas, all of which have a definite Biblical basis, furnished the outline of the course and we traced them in turn through the history of the Hebrews and the life of Jesus. Interest was good, discussion vital, and the incidental learnings in Hebrew history not negligible.

This was an attempt to relate more closely than is sometimes done the teaching of religion to those things which are obviously vital in contemporary life.

Another suggestion which I made to the dean of our college for the year 1943-44 is

the possible introduction of a course in "Techniques of Religious Living," designed to help both our soldier boys and the rest of us to find those sources of power which are so much needed under present circumstances. If "orientation courses" are a standard part of our curricula and worthy of academic credit, I see no reason why a course like this should not be a valid part of our contribution to the war effort.

2. *The attempt to galvanize students into a real interest in the message which religion has to teach.* I am not sure that what I am now about to say is "academically respectable," for there is a time-honored tradition that nothing is worthy of a place in the academic curriculum which is not dry and pedantic. Text-books are sometimes felt to be valuable in proportion to their size and weight and to be interesting is to lay oneself open to the charge of being superficial. Yet the inspiration of such men as William James at Harvard and "Billy" Phelps at Yale, or of my own revered teacher, Rollin Walker, at Ohio Wesleyan, gives me courage to say that I believe the problem of keeping students interested in war time (when even more than at other times any study of the humanities is likely to be looked upon by students as "a study of the dead past taught by dead professors") should lead us to redouble our effort to bring to life the subject-matter we teach, and to pitch it at the level where students actually are.

I am just completing a course in church history from which I have unashamedly omitted the Christological controversies and the teaching of the scholastics and which I have taught in terms of great men and great movements. I have been greatly helped by Roland Bainton's *The Church of Our Fathers*, written for high school students. While the library assignments have, of course, been in Walker and Rowe and Preserved Smith, et al., I have lightened the class sessions again and again by incidents from Bainton. I assigned parts of *Pilgrim's Progress* and *The Journal of John Wesley*

and when we came to the Salvation Army, I took to class and read aloud Vachel Lindsay's *General William Booth Enters Heaven*. And I have tried consistently to lay emphasis upon those aspects of church history which are reflected in the daily papers.

I say I may have been wrong, but I have been rewarded by having students call it "the most interesting course I have ever taken," and that is something in war time.

3. *Finally, there is the attempt to present the Christian message helpfully in the face of present-day tensions, without compromise and yet without offense.* May I quote a selection from a paper received in my Freshman class? The subject was the "History of Israel," but this boy didn't get much history of Israel in. What he got in was mostly a cry of anguish, but that was more important than history of Israel just at that time. He wrote:

"It seems sort of queer to me that people in those days as well as now think God is a just, kind, and loving One. And then they go out and kill other people to get what they want, and say God told them to. God led them to do all these things, take over the land of Canaan. . . .

"When people had done wrong and thought about it, they would pray to God to have the sin removed. If they were going to war, they would pray to God in hope that He would be on their side in the campaign. . . .

"We read in our lessons that God didn't believe in war. Yet they said that God sent them to take over another land. It would be a great world if every one would live the way of God. Love thy enemy as thyself. And practice the golden rule. But not everyone will look upon living in this fashion and there is nothing we can do but to defend ourselves when these people don't follow his word. . . .

"Being in this Religion class has made me think more than any class I've ever been in."

Granted that much of this might have
(Continued on page 191)

COMMUNICATIONS

Paul and Slavery

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

MUCH AS we all love and admire the King James version, the meaning of the words it uses has changed so much in three hundred years that it sometimes gives an entirely false impression to the modern reader. A convincing example of how it may mislead not just the man in the street but the most learned and scientific among us has lately been brought to my attention by one of my undergraduate students in the University of California at Los Angeles. It was in a book entitled *Whither Mankind?* edited by Charles A. Beard, and recommended for reading in a course in political science. In a chapter contributed by W. H. Van Loon, it read:

"To this very hour not a single theologian has been able to prove that Paul and his followers regarded the serf as anything but a two-footed piece of cattle" (p. 55).

This statement is followed by remarks about the attitude of the early church to slaves, intimating that it cared and did nothing for them.

It seems a pity that so false a picture of Paul's attitude to slaves and slavery should be presented to college students as scientific information on the teachings of the Bible. We may acquiesce in the exclusion of the study of the Bible from many public seats of learning, but not in the misrepresentation of its plain teachings smuggled in under the guise of political science. One can only wonder by what methods of scientific research it was arrived at, and how far such methods underlie the whole work in which it appears. Certainly no results could be more confidently stated: "To this very hour . . . not a single theologian . . ." What can be thought of a political science that is un-

aware of the decisive contribution of Paul and his followers to human freedom?

I can only suppose that Van Loon was dependent for his knowledge of Paul's views upon the King James version, and that version never uses the word slave in translating *doulos* in the New Testament. Anyone limited to the use of that version might well form the impression that Paul says nothing about slaves and took no interest in them. But as a matter of fact, Paul had a very definite concern for slaves, in general and in particular, as all editions of the Greek New Testament and all the principal translations of the past century and a half plainly show.

In the nine letters of his to which no reasonable exception can be taken, he uses the word twenty-one times. The slave meets us in the first line of the Pauline literature; in the Greek, slave is in fact the second word: "Paul, a slave . . ." He declares that Christ took the form of a slave, that he himself and Timothy and Epaphras are the slaves of Christ, that Tychicus is his fellow slave, that slaves have the same rights as free men in the Christian salvation, that the time is so short that slaves need not bother about emancipation, and that Philemon should forgive his runaway slave Onesimus (whom Paul speaks of as "my very heart") and receive him back as a dear brother. He takes great pains to insure his doing so. In the companion letter to the Colossians Paul has much to say about the duties of slaves to masters and of masters to slaves: "You who are masters must treat your slaves justly and fairly, and remember that you have a master, too, in heaven."

Paul's repeated statement that in the Christian experience there is no difference between slaves and free men, Gal. 3:28, Col. 3:11, really settles the question, as does I Cor. 7:22: "For a slave who has been called to union with the Lord is a freedman of the Lord, just as a free man who has been called is a slave of Christ."

But these facts are too familiar to all students of Paul to be repeated here. The simple fact is, the statement in *Whither Mankind?* is totally wrong. It is amazing that it has gone so long uncorrected, and so far as I am aware unchallenged.

That not a single theologian has ever been able to prove this about Paul, is equally wide of the mark. It is so plainly visible on the very face of most of Paul's letters that it can hardly be said to call for proof, but theologians have not failed to point it out. "Writing to the Corinthians," said Bishop Lightfoot, "he declares the absolute equality of the freeman and the slave in the sight of God. But meanwhile a principle is boldly enunciated which must in the end prove fatal to slavery" (Epistles to Colossians, and Philemon, 1875, p. 322) "His principle," writes A. H. McNeile, "was that Christianity places men in a status above the social distinction of master and slave" (*Introduction to the New Testament*, page 152, 1927). It would be easy to multiply such quotations from New Testament authorities.¹

In going on to say that early Christianity did nothing for slaves, *Whither Mankind?*

is equally misleading. Here it is enough to recall Harnack's summary of the status of slaves in the early church, published as long ago as 1902, in *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, I, pp. 167-70:

"Converted slaves, male and female, were regarded in the full sense of the term as brothers and sisters from the standpoint of religion. Compared with this, their position in the world was reckoned a matter of indifference. They shared the rights of church members to the fullest extent. Slaves could even become clergymen, and in fact bishops. As personalities (in the moral sense) they were just as highly esteemed as freemen. The sex of female slaves had to be respected, nor was their modesty to be outraged. The same virtues were to be expected from slaves as from freemen, and consequently their virtues earned the same honor. Masters and mistresses were strictly charged to treat all their slaves humanely, but on the other hand to remember that Christian slaves were their own brethren."

Of course the slave Hermas comes at once to one's mind,—one of the most influential Christian writers of the beginning of the second century,—and with him his brother Pius, the ninth bishop of the Roman church. Both would seem to have begun life at least as slaves.

I think the real attitude of Paul and the early church to slavery is too important a matter to be neglected, and I hope we can find ways to rectify the misunderstanding of it presented in *Whither Mankind?* And let us be on our guard against trusting too implicitly the vocabulary of King James, if it can produce misunderstandings like this with readers as sophisticated as Beard and Van Loon.

¹More recently (1932) Ernest F. Scott has written: "By the attitude he took up in Philemon and Colossians, Paul did more than any other man for the abolition of slavery." *Literature of the New Testament*, p. 177.

Should Prospective Ministers Major in Religion as Undergraduates?

JOHN PAUL WILLIAMS

PROFESSOR FLOYD V. FILSON in his article in the *Journal* for February, 1943, stated his opinion that a student who plans had stated my opposition to this commonly-held opinion, asserting that the policy of steering prospective ministers away from a serious study of religion as undergraduates is responsible in an important measure for the present weak state of religion on the average college campus.

Professor Filson is looking at the problem from the point of view of a teacher in a graduate school of theology. My own point of view is that of one who sees the effects of the present policy on the undergraduate campus. This policy, as I understand it, was promulgated at a time when undergraduate teaching of religion was often unscholarly, dogmatic, and evangelistic; at that time it was a common experience for seminary faculties to feel that it was necessary for students to discard much of their undergraduate religious learnings. But this situation has changed. Undergraduate teachers of religion today are for the most part using the same methods and expressing the same attitudes as are the graduate teachers of religion.

Surely any one who is acquainted with the college campus of today will agree that the American undergraduate has very inadequate religious opportunities. The reasons for this unfortunate situation are many and complex. Yet surely most members of NABI will agree that the absence on most campuses of strong departments of religion is a major factor in the situation. Now strong departments are possible in any field because a certain portion of the student body will elect the *advanced* courses. Yet the policy of those who professionally advise the prospective ministers—the natural clientele of such courses—is one which steers them

to attend a theological seminary should not as an undergraduate major in religion. In the November, 1942, issue of the *Journal* I away from any but the elementary courses in religion.

Surely majoring in religion as an undergraduate is not "to anticipate the theological course." Majoring is but to furnish the background which makes possible study that is really *graduate*. The ignorance of religion which is displayed on the part of so many beginning students is a source of serious embarrassment to the work of most theological schools. In my article, previously referred to, I outlined a possible way of giving students the broad, general background which is so necessary to the minister, and at the same time of permitting them to major in religion as undergraduates.

The theological schools, whether they realize it or not, have a responsibility to college students who are not prospective ministers. One significant effect of enlarged departments of religion would be to lift the level of religious experience and knowledge throughout the undergraduate campus. Nothing in our religious situation so appalls me as the failure of the church generally to take seriously the present lack of religious interest among college students. If we cannot make really significant efforts to stem the tide of collegiate irreligion then we must look for even less religious interest on the part of the next generation of laymen than is exhibited by the American public today.

I hope that Professor Filson or some other member of NABI will answer this communication and that the program committee of the Association will arrange for a discussion of this problem at the next meeting of the Association.

BOOK REVIEWS

Christian Pacifism

The Historic Church and Modern Pacifism.

By UMPHREY LEE. Nashville and New York: Abingdon - Cokesbury Press, 1943. 249 pages. \$2.00.

The president of Southern Methodist University has written an informative and temperate book on the attitudes toward war which have characterized Christian thinking through the centuries. Pacifists will do well to give careful consideration to this presentation. Non-pacifists, if they desire a balanced view, should read along with Umphrey Lee's book such studies by Christian pacifists as MacGregor's *New Testament Basis of Pacifism* and Cadoux's *The Early Christian Attitude Toward War*.

What Dr. Lee's book, as well as these others, makes clear is that nearly always Christians have had an uneasy conscience about participation in war and that there have throughout Christian history been multitudes of them who as a matter of fact refrained from such participation. This has included the overwhelming majority of Christians in the first two and a half centuries, most members of monastic orders, such outstanding saints as St. Francis, members of numerous sects in the Middle and Early Modern period, and the so-called Historic Peace Churches of today as well as many individual members of non-pacifist denominations.

For the most part these pacifists have contended that in refusing to take part in war they were following in the footsteps of the early Christians, of those who in time were closest to Jesus, and in the footsteps of Jesus himself. As to the former, it seems to me that Dr. Lee tries unduly to play down the unquestioned fact that very few of the first Christians did take part in war

and the point brought out by such scholars as Harnack and Cadoux that the arguments they gave for their non-participation were the common religious pacifist arguments that violence cannot overcome violence and so on. Thus he comments upon a pacifist passage of Justin Martyr: "These are noble words, but they must be taken for what they are. The Christians had not ceased to make war, for as a people they had never made war!"

His attempt to weaken the pacifist force of Jesus' teachings and actions seems to me at times superficial. He admits that the passage "Put up thy sword" contains "grim truth" but contends that it does not support the pacifist position because "Jesus did not resist, but in a few hours he was crucified." Surely it is inadmissible to suggest that Jesus or most intelligent pacifists hold any such crude concept of how the way of non-violence "works."

Much of Dr. Lee's criticism of the use made of Jesus' example rests on the view that the Jews of Jesus' day were not much interested in political issues and that Jesus himself did not deal with them. In view of the turbulence of Jewish history from say 100 B. C. to 70 A. D., the rise of one political Messiah after another, the terrible punishment which the Romans thought they had to inflict upon the Jews in their rebelliousness, I cannot understand the former notion at all. As for Jesus' own message, that is admittedly a debatable point. My own conviction is that Jesus, to use a phrase of Dr. Lee's, "stood in the line of prophets and sages" who were constantly dealing with economic and political issues from the standpoint of their ethical and spiritual implications; that no public figure in Palestine of that time could fail to make clear his attitude toward the Roman occupation any

more than a public personage in the lands at present occupied by Germany or Japan could avoid clarifying his attitude toward the occupying authority; and that Jesus definitely rejected the method of violence as a means of liberation for his people and sought to gain their adherence to another way which he believed practicable if only men would have faith in God rather than in "horses and chariots." "If thou hadst known the things that belong unto thy peace . . . but now there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be torn down."

Dr. Lee rightly contends, however, that whatever our conception of the teaching and example of Jesus, Christians if they are not to withdraw from the world or espouse a completely anarchist position, must face the problem of how an orderly society is to be maintained, the role of government in such a society, and their own relationship toward it. In this connection the position of the non-pacifist Christian seems to me specially vulnerable at two points. In the first place, they slip all too easily from the connection that some exercise of police force is necessary in order to maintain a stable society within a nation to the conclusion that war between and among nations is justified. This fails to give adequate weight to the difference between the motivation, the ethical quality and the results of the things men do in the former case as contrasted with the latter. Furthermore, it can plausibly be argued that war, certainly under modern conditions, is an expression and a cause of that very anarchy which the exercise of force is supposed to prevent.

In the second place, the non-pacifist Christian is as much obligated as the pacifist Christian to try to discover whether there are not techniques other than war and violent revolution (there is of course a contradiction between the very general accep-

tance of war but rejection of violent revolution as a means of thwarting evil which is characteristic of many Christians) by the use of which they may discharge their duties as citizens and civilized societies might defend themselves against possible attacks by aggressors. As it is, in a crisis Christians always join in resort to the methods and means of warfare—alike in the United States and Germany. They have nothing distinctive to suggest. This increasingly results in their being "towed like slaves in the wake of history" as Maritain suggested in a remarkable chapter, "The Purification of Means," in his *Freedom In the Modern World*. Their actions are controlled by decisions which are made for them by others and "the barbarism of technique" which they are forced to employ has no connection left with Christian standards.

Gandhi, Maritain goes on to suggest, "has shown his originality in the separation and the systematic organization of patience and voluntary suffering as a special method of warfare. . . . Men who attach importance to spiritual values . . . are likely to be led willy-nilly to a solution along these lines, if it be true that secular means of warfare are less and less capable of claiming the first place in their thought, either because the weapons to be used have fallen into the hands of the enemy or because those means of warfare can now ensure success only through the agency of sin. It is possible in these circumstances that new modes of political activity may make their appearance."

Here is a field of study and experimentation which neither pacifist nor non-pacifist Christians have ever begun to explore adequately and where they might work together enthusiastically.

A. J. MUSTE

The Fellowship of Reconciliation

Philosophy

Personalism in Theology. Essays in Honor of Albert Cornelius Knudson. Edited by EDGAR S. BRIGHTMAN, Boston: Boston University Press, 1943. x + 257 pages. \$2.50.

Personalism in Theology is a testimony to the vitality of the philosophy of Personalism and its relevance to contemporary problems in metaphysics, philosophy of religion, ethics, theology, and the interpretation of scientific, historical, and educational developments. To Dean Emeritus Albert C. Knudson of Boston University School of Theology belongs much of the credit for this vitality, for he not only expounded and developed the Personalism of Borden Parker Bowne, but he also re-integrated it with the currents of thought in our day. For this reason Dean Knudson may find even greater satisfaction in the twelve instructive essays contributed by former students, long-time friends, and associates to this small, necessarily incomplete, but packed volume. (A Bibliography of Dr. Knudson's works, compiled by Professor Carroll D. Hildebrand, ends the book.)

It is especially fitting that his scholarly colleague and friend, Professor Elmer A. Leslie, should write the warm sketch of Knudson, "the man." Bishop Francis J. McConnell, in "Bowne and Personalism," sets Bowne's philosophical battle in the metaphysical perspective of his time, and points out the ambivalence in Bowne's theory of the reality of time and the shortcomings in his social theory.

In "Personality as a Metaphysical Principle," Professor Brightman expounds the central thesis of Personalism, that personality, when critically defined, may well be the "key to reality," since it is more inclusive as a philosophical explanation than categories like time, space, and number,—which, indeed, are meaningless independent of personality. Professor Gerald Ensley, in

the fresh and illuminating essay, "The Personality of God," tests the hypothesis of a personal God by its adequacy to account for all the data of human experience including scientific principles and facts.

Readers of this journal will be especially interested in Professor Robert H. Pfeiffer's summary of the "development of theological thought in the Old Testament" ("Personalistic Elements in the Old Testament"). One wonders, however, whether Professor Pfeiffer's philosophical statement: "Human reason is triumphant in logic and in mathematics, but helpless when confronted with life" (p. 159.), when used as a principle for interpreting development in the conception of God as held by Job, Amos, Hosea, and others, does not create a false disjunction between faith and reason and impose an artificial structure on the way these seers "found" God.

Professor Georgia Harkness, in "Divine Sovereignty and Human Freedom," also poses a real problem. Does the statement: "... human freedom thwarts, though it can never permanently obstruct, the divine creative process" (p. 142.), take human freedom seriously enough? What good reason would lead a gracious God to achieve his human ends in some non-persuasive way? (Or isn't that implied in his statement?) One also pauses when reading that human redemption is impossible except "through the free, loving, personal activity of God in Christ" (p. 150.). Is it really grace to so "route" the path of freedom?

The remaining essays deserve more consideration than is possible here. Professor Hildebrand's "Personalism and Nature," Dr. Edward T. Ramsdell's plea for "The Cultural Integration of Science and Religion," Professor Ralph T. Flewelling's "Personalism and the Trend of History," Dr. Walter G. Muelder's "Personality and Christian Ethics," as well as Dr. Willis J. King's "Personalism and Race," and Dean

Earl B. Marlatt's "Personalism and Religious Education" are both revealing and provocative as they bring out the power of the personalistic hypothesis.

PETER A. BERTOCCHI

Bates College

The Christian Philosophy of History. By SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943. 222 pages. \$2.00.

In this little book a social historian turns his attention to the philosophy of history. It is not surprising to find that Dr. Case advocates what may be labelled a "horizontal" view of history in contrast with a number of other current philosophies of history which tend to stress the vertical reference and to find meaning in the transcendental and eternal rather than in the human and temporal.

One of the chief values of this well-written book lies in the brief and incisive summaries of present-day interpretations of history. These summaries serve the dual purpose of aiding the reader to see the flaws in the different theories rejected by the former dean of the Divinity School at the University of Chicago and of understanding thus indirectly the position which the writer is to state positively in the concluding chapters of the book. Thus we are told that C. H. Dodd "revives the old distinction between secular and sacred history and sees in the latter the true significance of temporal events" (p. 116). Similarly, Otto Piper regards "the attempt of Christians to establish the Kingdom of God on earth by making socially effective the ideals of Christian teaching . . . a misguided effort" (pp. 108, 109).

Variant interpretations of history are explained (away?) by reference to the social situation which produced them. Thus "it is not difficult to understand Kierkegaard's type of thinking when it is viewed in the light of his peculiar personality and con-

temporary situation" (in Denmark). Likewise, "Berdyayev reads the meaning of the total course of history under the magnifying glass of calamities experienced by the Russian Orthodox church as a result of the Bolshevik Revolution, which ultimately forced the author into exile" (p. 102). Tillich "openly affirms that he has reared his philosophy of history upon the basis of reality as experienced in the crises and catastrophes of the last three decades in middle Europe" (p. 104). On this basis, it may perhaps be permissible to describe the author's thesis as an American philosophy of history.

The key word in this American philosophy of history is human "activism." The author does not, of course, eliminate the activity of God in history, but stresses the thought that God has to work through men. Views of history which stress the belief that meaning can be given to history only by God's down-reach and never by man's up-reach are branded as "philosophies of despair." "History teaches us that God has chosen to work through the instrumentality of good men to effect the eradication of evil" (p. 215). "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation but by dint of strenuous endeavor on the part of men . . ." (p. 218).

This book contains a tonic for those who are in danger of despairing of the capacity of man to create a better world. It provides an over-all view of human history which tends to put into truer perspective the discouragements of recent historical events. No doubt there is a need at the present time to correct the tendency to be one-sided in viewing only the dark side of the human situation. If this book strikes some readers as itself one-sided, it may be argued that this kind of partial view is needed as an antidote to the more common tendency today to see only the darker side.

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

Theology

Redemption and Revelation. By H. WHEELER ROBINSON, New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1942. xlviii + 320 pages. \$3.00.

More than any other English-speaking scholar Principal Wheeler Robinson of Regent's Park College, Oxford, has made available to the modern student the resources and insights of the Biblical tradition. The importance of his work lies in his ability to focus these resources upon contemporary theological thinking. It is an error to read this new book solely as the crowning piece of a theological trilogy.¹ It is this, but it is more. For Principal Robinson has contributed as few others to our knowledge of Biblical psychology and anthropology², of Hebraic conceptions of community³, and of the correctly *historical* nature of Biblical revelation. His small and unpretentious volume on *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament* (1912) is still the best of its kind, while his many more popular articles and books reflect a characteristic religious vitality and sensitivity.

We greatly need the kind of Biblical interpretation that does not reduce every idea to a minimum of illumination. Signs are not wanting of a recrudescence of interest in Biblical religion, but the vanguard is occupied by the systematic theologians and not by Biblical scholars. In Europe Hempel, Eichrodt, and Kohler have written excellent O. T. theologies, but they seem thus far to have made relatively little impression upon their neo-orthodox and other colleagues.

¹The two preceding volumes are on *The Christian Doctrine of Man* (1911) and *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit* (1928).

²See e.g. his important discussions on "Hebrew Psychology in Relation to Pauline Anthropology" in *Mansfield College Essays* 1909, and "Hebrew Psychology" in *The People and the Book* (ed. by A. S. Peake, 1925).

³See his influential discussion of "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality" in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, Töpelmann's, Berlin, 1936.

The present volume places its stress primarily upon the historical nature of Christian revelation, in contrast to the two former volumes where the emphasis was primarily psychological and anthropological, in the one case, and philosophical, in the other. The Biblical and especially the Hebraic contribution receives proportionately greater attention, and it is in these parts of the book that the discussion is most rewarding and penetrating. It is to be hoped that any possible theological inadequacies will not blind students to the vivid and relevant interpretation of Biblical religion. The chief criticism at this point is that the discussions are in general rather brief. It seems to me especially unfortunate that so little is said of eschatology, especially because the purposive nature of God's activity is so constantly and discerningly stressed.

The Christian interpretation of history involves the following assumptions: (1) God's control of history is such as to make man free and morally responsible. (2) The actuality of historical event involves both physical happening and spiritual apprehension, which makes of it a category unique and *sui generis*. (3) History is creative of its own values. (4) An event is in itself never central, however, but is described by the person's "transvaluation" of it. (5) History must vindicate God's will and purpose, but it is unable to achieve this; "the values of history which require a temporal order for their actualization, also require an eternal order for their interpretation and justification." Yet the temporal order is so caught up into the eternal as to have meaning and value for God.

The early chapters are a defence of the validity of Christian experience. The authority both of the Bible and of the Church is derived from the interpretation of God's activity in human experience. "The divine drama of history which the Bible sets forth in the making of a people, the inspiration of prophets, the discipline of exile, the death on the Cross, is seen to be still

in its fifth act, the coming of the Kingdom of God. Through them all His spirit is active" (p. 10). To the charge that the content of revelation may be illusory, Professor Robinson appeals precariously yet with abundant illustration to "the ministry of error" in the apprehension of revelation; to the complaint that language is an inadequate instrument, he appeals to the symbolic nature of speech. The Holy Spirit infuses into our language about the unseen a sacramental quality, "and so transforms 'symbolic' into 'real' knowledge" (p. 55). The purpose of God which is reflected in his initiative in creation is continued in His redemptive activity in history. God's revelation in history is revelation of a redemption.

The diversity so characteristic of Biblical religion in general is vividly shown in the great variety of the media of revelation. In his treatment of the physical instruments of revelation Professor Robinson devotes a good section to "nature and miracle." A miracle must be worthy of its source in the full religious sense. The physical experience of revelation is classically portrayed in the prophetic consciousness. Here the author is at his best. His discussion is corrective to extreme views concerning prophetic ecstasy. Yet with his understanding of Hebrew psychology and anthropology he does not fall into the pitfall of undue modernization. The historical revelation of Hebraic-Christian religion culminates in the life and work of Jesus. "The fullness of the time for His coming depends on the vital and intimate relation of His Person and Work to all the other factors of history, past, present, and future. . . . His life, death, and resurrection must not be viewed in isolation as a Barthian bolt from the blue, any more than they can be explained as purely human events" (p. 178).

The final section is devoted to "the fact of redemption." The Messiahship of Jesus is interpreted in the light of the suffering servant, who Robinson believes was a major influence after Caesarea Philippi. It is the

quality of Jesus' personality, his holiness, that marks its nearness to God. Christ "is the redemptive personality of God Himself." We do greatest justice to the permanent values of Christian faith "if we start with our own experience of God in Christ as of the actuality of God's redemptive personality manifested in the space-time order" (p. 205). The various categories in which the idea of redemption is expressed are evaluated. Aulén's view of redemption as victory over good and evil is examined and criticized; the traditional interpretation of Christ's offering as sacrifice is viewed in the light of its Old Testament antecedents, but it does not furnish an adequate doctrine. Christ's suffering inevitably involves the suffering of God. "The spiritual suffering of the Redeemer is our one safe guide into the heart of God" (p. 272). The redemptive act of the Cross must be understood in relation to God. The essential act of redemption is seen in God's response to the suffering which arises from man's guilt. By bearing it, He transforms the suffering and thus removes the guilt. But further, in the realm of the eternal this divine transformation which took place on Calvary is extended to all human history, both before and after Christ. "The real meaning of an event is the ultimate fact arising from that event. The meaning of all the events of history is, at last, the only thing that matters about history" (p. 275).

This review has done scant justice to the richness of Principal Robinson's book. It is theological writing in a high tradition. It is grounded in adequate historical scholarship. It is the work of a mature and well-stored mind. It is true that the discussion is a little sketchy and fragmentary. It seems to me that Greek and Hebraic modes of thought constantly appear over against each other unresolved. Theocentric and anthropocentric categories are confused. Pre-occupation with psychology seems to me at times to attenuate the richness of the historic tradition, which Robinson in many

respects understands so well. But important as these considerations may be, they should not blind us to the wealth of learning and insight, the vivid and provocative style, and the wide-ranging comprehensiveness of the book. I hope all our members will read it more than once.

JAMES MULLENBURG

Pacific School of Religion

Our Eternal Contemporary. By WALTER MARSHALL HORTON. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942. xx + 180 pages. \$2.00.

"A Study of the Present-Day Significance of Jesus" is the subtitle of this latest book by Professor Horton. The question posed is: Is Jesus just a great historical character, or is he our eternal contemporary, embodying God's power and wisdom forever? The answer is: He is both; we cannot isolate the figure of the historical Jesus from the spiritual development of the Church—there must be a sense of the continuity of the historic life of Jesus through his Mind or Spirit, in the Church, and available to us today by faith. "That which Christian faith apprehends as divine in the New Testament is not merely the individual Man Christ Jesus, but a movement of events that begins with him and passes over to his followers."

The book is both a statement of the author's personal faith (a warmly evangelical faith) and an attempt to reopen the Christological problem in the light of liberal thought and historical criticism of the New Testament. Christology, he feels, has unfortunately been neglected in America largely because of the overwhelming influence of the Ritschlian school and its denial of the Living Christ. The moratorium on Christology must now be ended; indeed critical New Testament study has itself been tending toward greater appreciation of the centrality of the doctrine of Christ. The author confidently states that the "liberal" portrait of Jesus "has now been irretriev-

ably condemned by New Testament criticism, as a spurious modernization which falsifies the Great Master it purports to represent."

The general features of the treatment (Jesus as Leader, as Savior, as Victor: Then and Now; chapters 2, 3, 4) are acknowledged to have grown out of the reading of two books by Karl Heim, to whom a public message is written in the *Preface*. The scholarly reader is advised to realize that the book is addressed primarily to laymen, and that the specialist will find some additional light on the direction of the author's thinking in the three appendixes, as well as in the introduction.

Of special interest to the teacher of Bible is Professor Horton's statement concerning the relation between historical criticism and Christian faith (Appendix A and pages 17-24). This statement is basic to the whole treatment, to the extent that a balance is sought between these two approaches. His position is that criticism and faith are relatively independent and in tension with each other—that when either steps out of its limited sphere to legislate for the other, it should be sent back within bounds; and it is assumed that theology (in this case, Christology) is superior to both and must draw upon both, using each to supplement and correct the other. (Appendix B, which readers of this *Journal* have already had the privilege of reading, furnishes a fine extension of the author's advocacy of the supplementary roles of the functional and the historical-critical treatments of the Christian faith.)

It is at this point that one wonders whether the results of these two approaches can ever be fully or satisfactorily compounded, and whether Professor Horton has completely succeeded in "weaving these two sorts of knowledge into one composite account of the Work and Person of Jesus Christ." He has indeed made a notable contribution in this direction, and one which

will be helpful to many who have long voted with him that the task needs greatly to be prosecuted. (See also W. A. Smart's "The Contemporary Christ," reviewed in this *Journal*, Nov., 1942; and John Knox's "The Man Christ Jesus" upon which Professor Horton bases much of the critical as well as theological aspects of his work).

The method followed is stated thus: "starting with the conviction, won through personal discipleship to Jesus, that Jesus is our Eternal Contemporary . . . we proceed to test this conviction by casting the actual historical Jesus, the Man of Nazareth as described by historical criticism, in this sublime role. Does he limp pathetically in the part, or does he wear his regal robes as one ordained to rule?"

Criticism, he finds, aids us in discerning three layers in the teaching of Jesus: the obviously transient, the partly transient—partly lasting, and the absolutely eternal. The last is found in Jesus' reference of all questions to the supreme criterion of the Will of God, interpreted in terms of limitless righteousness and love. But the enactment of the teaching in a Life, and especially in the Cross as its culmination in Jesus' case, becomes the seal of finality and eternity, and shall never pass away. The apocalyptic element in Jesus' teaching requires some restatement, since later events qualify the original conceptions. Yet even some aspects of apocalyptic, Professor Horton feels, are singularly appropriate to our own age with its pressing problems of human destiny; our age, too, has the same 'apocalyptic' quality" as did the age of Jesus and his early followers, and "the apocalyptic insight that inspired them is of lasting significance."

Appendix C on the Creeds of Nicaea and Chalcedon deserves mention also, since it attests a sort of conversion experience in the author's attitude toward these creedal instruments, and thus fits in with his plea for a return to the Christ of the New Testa-

ment and of the creeds. His conclusion here is that these "and other creeds of the Church Universal" serve to clarify the meaning of Scripture and represent the main line of development in Christian theology—almost, if not altogether, an organic continuity from the historical Jesus, through the New Testament Church and onward.

Too much cannot be said for the forthright sincerity and lucidity of Professor Horton's writing, a unique evidence of which is seen in his "Epilogue for non-Christians" but which is present straight through his steady drive toward full and sound appreciation of the relevancy of Jesus to modern need. There is a homiletic and apologetic quality in some passages, especially in chapters three and four, which illumines the argument with the glow of conviction. This is a book with a message that had to be written and, let us hope, prophetic not only in itself but prophetic also of the more that waits to be said by this author and others in these critical days.

JOHN W. FLIGHT

Haverford College

One Lord, One Faith. By FLOYD V. FILSON. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943. 256 pages. \$2.00.

A current issue of importance is the degree of unity within the New Testament. Did the early church reflect a hodge-podge of divergent beliefs stemming from multiple environmental influences, or did it maintain a constant reference to a distinctive and normative center? Granting a free adaptation of outlooks as the church moved from Jewish to Gentile culture, did these modifications undermine an essential continuity of faith? As the title indicates, Professor Filson defends the thesis that the mind and message of Jesus were faithfully preserved in the primitive church. Centrifugal forces were everywhere met by a stubborn centripetal attraction to the outlook of Jesus.

The treatment of such a thesis must de-

pend upon the particular audience addressed. In this case, the audience is composed not of sceptical unbelievers but of Christian laymen of the more conservative stamp, whose loyalty to the church has been shaken by rumors emanating from academic circles to the effect that the early church was really disloyal to Jesus in erecting a body of dogma far removed from his intention. The book seeks to reassure them at two points: the church was loyal to the central emphasis of Jesus; critical scholarship does have positive results to offer, which should justify its existence even to dubious conservatives. For this purpose the book is well designed.

The argument falls into two sections, the first being a defense of the credibility of the Christian writings as sources for knowledge of Jesus. cursory examination is given to all the New Testament books, with passing recognition of critical problems, and with a uniformly comforting conclusion that every writing maintains direct connection with Jesus and gives a trustworthy portrait of his life and work. This section suffers from vague generalities made almost inevitable by the brevity of space. The general validity of the tradition as a whole may be affirmed with reason, but to be most helpful such a discussion needs a careful definition of validity, a sharp statement of the problem, a breaking up of the tradition into more manageable units so that accretions may be precisely distinguished from the nuclei. Without careful documentation, conclusions are bound to appear as opinions only.

The second section analyzes the pillars of Christian thought in the areas of theology, eschatology, Christology, pneumatology, ecclesiology and ethics (although the author fortunately abjures these technical terms). In each case the position of Jesus is compared with that of Christian writers; in each case a common core of belief is isolated and defined. The area of fundamental

agreement is shown to be much larger than usually recognized.

The argument here necessarily moves in a circle: we must distill the message of Jesus from later writings and then compare this distillation with the attitudes of those same writings. In the process, the extent of continuity between two chronological periods is easily confused with the extent of consistency within the same period. Professor Filson's treatment is more effective in showing the consistency of Christian witness than in demonstrating the continuity between Jesus and Christians. Particularly is this true of such matters as the conceptions of the place of Christ, the work of the Spirit, and the function of the church. In these areas, the death and resurrection of Jesus bulked larger in Christian thought than in the thought of Jesus. Hence it is hazardous and even misleading to ground Christian faith merely in the message of Jesus. To early Christians these events marked a real break, a decisive discontinuity within the historical process. In these events was found the boundary between Christianity and Judaism, between the Old and New Covenants. Here, rather than in the teaching of Jesus, was experienced the ultimate revelation of divine judgment and redemption.

This raises a problem of prime moment for early Christians. It was not simply the problem of the continuity between Jesus and the church, but the problem of the relativity of all history, the basic breach between human history and the kingdom of God. In this context, union with Jesus' thought was important, but more important was union with their Lord in his death and resurrection. This deeper experiential union is confirmed by Professor Filson, but the avowed thesis and structure of his book do not adequately provide for the dialectical character of life "in Christ."

PAUL S. MINEAR

Garrett Biblical Institute.

The Meaning of Repentance. By WILLIAM DOUGLAS CHAMBERLAIN. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943. 238 pages. \$2.00.

Professor Chamberlain holds that the interests of both individual and social life require a restudy of the meaning of repentance. The term is too often interpreted to mean "do penance" or "feel regret." It ought rather to be understood as saying to each individual, "Change your mind." To find the content of the term, the author makes a detailed study of the New Testament statements about repentance.

Basic to the argument is the insistence that repentance is not merely negative, or limited to the time of entrance upon the Christian life. "Repentance is a pilgrimage from the mind of the flesh to the mind of Christ" (p. 47). It continues throughout the Christian life on earth. It "is a revamping of the outlook and outreach of all life. . . . Repentance in the New Testament sense covers conversion, reconciliation, regeneration, sanctification, and ultimate perfection" (p. 223).

In the final chapter the application of the conclusions to preaching and teaching is developed, but in all the earlier chapters occur passages which insist upon the urgent need of genuine repentance. No person or group can live a wholesome life without first getting straightened out in basic attitudes.

There is a warmly constructive and earnestly practical note about the book. It is the work of an intelligent conservative. I would raise two questions about its argument. In the first place, while the author makes a careful study of the Hebrew and Greek words for "remorse" and "repentance," and recognizes that Jesus spoke Aramaic, he does not show satisfactorily what Aramaic word John the Baptist and Jesus may have used. If, as seems probable in spite of Chamberlain's doubts, the Aramaic word was *tub*, "turn," the idea of a change of mind is not so prominent as Chamberlain

makes it, and the demand for a change of behavior receives emphasis. This would not exclude the demand for a right attitude, but it would lay greater stress on the need for upright action.

In the second place, while it is right to demand repentance as long as life is imperfect, the feeling grows in reading the book that repentance is too nearly equated with the total range of the Christian life. It is true, as Chamberlain contends, that the demand for repentance is an important and repeated theme of the New Testament, but it is also true that the New Testament does not think of repentance as a constant factor in all phases of the entire Christian life. It has more of a preparatory character than Chamberlain will admit.

FLOYD V. FILSON

McCormick Theological Seminary

The Bible

The Bible Is Human. By LOUIS WALLIS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. xvi + 330 pages. \$2.50.

This "concluding number" of Louis Wallis' trilogy of socio-economic studies in Hebrew history appears at a momentous time in contemporary religious thought. When a major trend in present-day theological discussion would view Biblical history as a more or less completely supernatural intrusion into world events, it is well to be reminded that, after all, "the Bible is human." In fact, as the subtitle, "A Study in Secular History," indicates, this book is a brilliant exposition of the thesis that the development of Hebrew monotheism was essentially a human achievement resulting from social and economic processes.

The question of the nature of divine revelation—or its absence—implied in the title is not the author's concern. Throughout the book the reader senses the thoroughly humanistic emphasis that it is everywhere man's idea of God—not transcendent or

even immanent Deity as an entity—which has been significantly operative in history. The bulk of the volume—210 of its pages—is a really masterful treatment of Israel's development in Palestine from prehistoric times to the Exile. In a twenty-page introduction the author very cogently argues that traditional Jewish and Christian orthodoxy and even recent literary criticism have miserably misinterpreted Hebrew history. In his indictment of previous interpreters, however, he utterly neglects the excellent social-historical study of the Bible made by a number of German, British, and American scholars in the last few years.

Old Testament students are deeply indebted to Mr. Wallis for his penetrating analysis in two previous volumes, *Sociological Study of the Bible* (1912) and particularly *God and the Social Process* (1935). The present volume presents little additional material, but a few especially emphasized departures from accepted interpretations are worth noting—and questioning: Mr. Wallis' doubts concerning the rigidity of the documentary hypothesis and particularly his recognition of early elements in E are certainly in order, but to claim J as clearly Exilic, and partly on the basis of its relative avoidance of the term *baal*, seems unwarranted without further evidence. In his assessment of the value of the prophets, Elijah is the great overshadowing figure. Moses is but a legendary copy of Elijah, and the patriarchal narratives are simply ingenious inventions of Ephraimite and occasionally Judaic narrators to explain late Israelite history. Because economically and sociologically the national center was in Ephraim, not Jerusalem, "the rule of the house of David was only an interlude which temporarily deflected the movement of Hebrew history beyond its natural orbit" (p. 37).

Mr. Wallis' familiar, thought-provoking interpretation of Israel's religion is excellently presented in this new volume: The *baalim* were the selfish, despotic, urban land-

holders greedily grabbing property which, according to Hebrew *mishpat*, "social justice," was not subject to commercial transaction, but belonged inalienably to the social group represented by the pastoral, democratic, rural *adonim*. Hence, the long-desired victory of the Lord (*Adon*) Yahweh—memorialized to this day in the oft-repeated *Shema* of Deuteronomy 6:4—was the victory of the divine symbol of this Hebrew concept of justice. The genius of the Hebrew culture lay in the fact that only in Israel were these incompatible Yahwistic and Baalistic regimes brought face to face in the same social group, and thus only in Israel was "generated the social force which impelled the Yahweh-religion upward through higher and higher ethical stages" (p. 213). So it is, summarizes Mr. Wallis in his excellent concluding section on "The Significance of Bible History," that "the religion of the Bible as a whole (New Testament as well as Old) is an evolution of ethical insight reacting to the secular pressure of history." It is to be hoped that Mr. Wallis will not carry out his threat of making this his "concluding number" in Biblical studies, but will carry on his penetrating sociological and economic insights into post-Exilic and New Testament times.

The Bible Is Human is a very valuable book for every Biblical student to read for stimulation and to return to often for detailed suggestions in historical interpretation. Its practical usefulness is enhanced by an ample index of 24 pages, an interesting chart presenting the author's "conventionalized scheme of Hebrew history," and 61 pages of supporting appendixes. One appendix definitely—and perhaps irrelevantly—dates the book, for it is a reprint of a paper comparing British and German Biblical scholarship first published in 1918 and now republished "because of its bearing on the general situation leading up to Nazism."

CHARLES F. KRAFT

Albion College

A Conservative Introduction to the Old Testament. By SAMUEL A. CARTLEDGE. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1943. 238 pages. \$1.75.

The most significant aspect of this volume is the meaning of the adjective in its title. If this book be really what its title suggests, let there be rejoicing in Zion among all those deeply concerned as to the menace to peace and understanding within Christendom caused by wide cleavages between conservative and liberal (or, as the author calls them, "Radical") interpretations of the Bible! If Doctor Cartledge, who is Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia, and author of a similar recent volume of New Testament introduction, really represents present-day Biblical conservatism—or even a major trend in such thinking, there is real occasion for joy at the publication of this book. Here, indeed, is very fair-minded, intelligent, clearly expressed interpretation of the Old Testament by one who believes he has "reached conclusions in harmony with the ancient beliefs of historical Christianity": belief in a personal and miracle-working God, in the Bible as His inspired Word, in Christianity as His self-revelation, in "Jesus Christ as the God-man who died an atoning death for the sins of those who would believe on Him."

This is the theological platform upon which the author stands, but the reader at once is made aware that Biblical inspiration was not mechanical, that the Bible must be understood by use of a "grammatico-historical" interpretation which recognizes the psychology of the "ancient Orientals" who wrote it, that God's revelation (His revelation, to be sure, not man's discovery of truth) was progressive, and that again and again we must ferret out the abiding values in this library of books written "over a period of over a thousand years." This point of view concerning Biblical study, it may be

observed with great appreciation, is almost indistinguishable from that not so long ago termed "the modern use of the Bible". Is there no real difference, despite their theological presuppositions, between conservatives and liberals in their approach to Bible study?

Furthermore, Professor Cartledge's method and conclusions do not belie his stated principles of Biblical interpretation. He frankly recognizes the difficulties caused by divergence between Greek and Hebrew renderings and the various manuscript readings. He points out historical inconsistencies, particularly of dating, within such books as Samuel and Kings and admits the difficulty of distinguishing between tradition and history in many books. Above all, he is not dogmatic in his conclusions regarding date and authorship. He much prefers to state various scholarly opinions and let the reader draw his own conclusions—a thoroughly scientific procedure. For example, he does this most notably in his long presentation of arguments for and against Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the documentary theory.

At times, in fact, the author seems to be urging his conservative colleagues to adopt more liberal interpretations, and some of his suggestions are amazing for a self-styled "Conservative"; to wit: Hosea's wife "may have been one of the many religious prostitutes of that day." "It is to be regretted" that "a belief in the historicity of Jonah has been made by some a test for orthodoxy". Indeed, in this case as in the case of Daniel and others, even Jesus' references to the books do not prove historicity or authorship, for "the incarnate Jesus" may not have had "complete knowledge about certain non-essential things." Jonah, Ruth, and Esther may all be late books with simply an historical kernel. Some of the Psalms are as late as Maccabean times. Proverbs and Ecclesiastes are not all the work of Solomon, nor need Lamentations necessarily be Jeremiah's. Despite the allegorical interpretation

of the Song of Songs so very common in Jewish and Christian circles, "should it be considered strange that Scripture has a place for songs of pure love between a man and a woman?" And the climax: While "it is impossible for a true Radical to believe in real predictive prophecy" and the "Conservative" is under no such handicap, all the evidence points strongly to the conclusion that the Book of Daniel is Maccabean after all! Will not ultra-conservatives shudder as they read these amazing ideas of a "Conservative"?

In plan this "introduction" follows the order of the Jewish Canon—Law, Prophets, and Writings—except that the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are introduced immediately after Kings to complete the historical books. There is no new contribution to Biblical scholarship here, but this volume does present in simple fashion—and rather too abbreviated form—much of the scholarly opinion concerning unity, authorship, and date of the Old Testament books. The suggested outlines of the contents of the books do not aid materially their understanding, and one wishes that the author had spent more of his space in presenting the great message of each of these great Old Testament books, especially if this volume is to be used to introduce the beginning student to the Old Testament. The more advanced student will pursue his critical study in the great introductions of Bewer, Oesterley and Robinson, or Pfeiffer mentioned by Professor Cartledge in his "Selected Bibliography".

CHARLES F. KRAFT

Albion College

Religion in Literature

The Healing of the Waters. By AMOS N. WILDER. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943. 89 pages. \$1.75.

Mr. Wilder's little book of original poems will be of particular interest to those who

know his illuminating discussion of modern verse in *The Spiritual Aspects of the New Poetry*, which appeared two or three years ago. It is at once apparent—and to be sure, we could have expected this—that Mr. Wilder does not belong to the Victorian or Georgian tradition, in thought or expression. A considerable portion of his verse, the more striking portion, perhaps, "echoes the stresses of the time," to use his own phrase, presenting the chaos of the modern age, its blind rages, and lost hopes. Like the Hebrew prophets, from whom he sometimes takes his themes, he cries out against the devastating sin of man in a world doomed to destruction. The lines are strong, at times stark in their suggestive power. They carry an impression of intellectual grasp, of range and depth; there is nothing flabby or shallow. Yet one must add that the lyric touch is not here, the lift of song, which is poetry's ancient and high distinction. Even in his lesser poems, Mr. Wilder is not a music-maker or a dreamer of dreams. Beauty is not his province, "joy without name, whose only voice is song." Sometimes the lines labor; sometimes the thought lies buried beneath the lumber of words.

The title of the book suggests the idea which the author evidently intends to be its dominant note—"the healing of the waters," the cleansing of this sorry world through the deepening of the spiritual life in man. This note is sounded in various ways in several of the thirty or forty poems that make up the volume, but surely it fails to receive the emphasis and clearcut expression that the titles of Mr. Wilder's two books would lead us to expect. There is no such concentration of attention as one finds, for instance, in the poetry of Matthew Arnold or Thomas Hardy. The poems of Mr. Wilder seem to spring from the varying moods of a strongly intellectual mind wrestling with the powers of darkness, but holding strong to some certain faith within.

GEORGE C. CLANCY

Beloit College

Candles in the Night. Jewish Tales by Gentile Authors. Edited by JOSEPH L. BARON. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1940. 391 pages. \$2.50.

Stars and Sand. Jewish Notes by Non-Jewish Notables. Edited by JOSEPH L. BARON. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1943. 555 pages.

Rabbi Joseph L. Baron of the Congregation Emanu-El B'ne Jeshurun, Milwaukee, has been an active and outstanding participant in the movement to create better understanding between Christian and Jew. He has worked closely with the National Conference of Christians and Jews in its campaign for tolerance and mutual understanding. These books are two of a longer series of anthologies dedicated to the same ends. The approach made in these books is a refreshing and imaginative one. It is to thumb literature and history for good things said about Jews by non-Jews. Thus the earlier volume carries the sub-title, "Jewish Tales by Gentile Authors," while the current volume is called "Jewish Notes by Non-Jewish Notables."

Candle in the Night is a collection of tales which in many cases have distinct literary value. Certain selections would make good collateral reading in courses dealing with religious history; for example, Villiers de L'Isle Adam's "The Torture of Hope" and the light it throws on the motivation of at least one of the Inquisitors in medieval Spain. Per Hallström's "Arsareth" portrays vividly the pull exerted upon the minds and hearts of oppressed Jews throughout the ages by the Messianic expectation. Not all of the selections in *Candles in the Night* make pleasant reading. It has been a long, black night for the Jew, and such a story as "The Saluting Doll," published as recently as 1937 in the U. S. A., proves that the dawn has not yet broken, if proof were needed.

Stars and Sand (title taken from Genesis 22:7) contains more than four hundred brief statements from Gentile authors who "breathe the spirit of humaneness toward Israel." Some of these have a distinctly contemporary interest, such as that of Georges Clemenceau "On the Anti-Semitic Eruption in Algiers," originally published in the form of an editorial in 1895 (pp. 224-225). The description of the Nazi "Burning of the Books" as reported by an eyewitness, Lilian Thomson Mowrer, wife of Edgar A. Mowrer, is well-worth handy reference (pp. 263-265). Anne O'Hare McCormick's suggestion that the status of Anti-Semitism is a "Test of Civilization" (pp. 266-267) is worth thinking about. Teachers of Christian Ethics will welcome handy reference to such material as the statement of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ dealing with "the Christian Attitude toward Anti-Semitism" (pp. 329-331). This particular volume is graced by eighteen handsome plates, some of them of unusual interest.

The editor and publishers are to be congratulated for this contribution toward better understanding between Jew and Christian.

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

Mysticism

New Eyes for Invisibles. By RUFUS M. JONES, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943. 185 pages. \$2.00.

Professor Rufus Jones, in his most recent book, *New Eyes for Invisibles*, states his own mystical message for the present crisis. In the course of the book, he confesses that he does not have the formulae for the practical solutions of the manifold problems that vex this dark time in which we live, but rather hopes to "tell how to cultivate the garden of the soul in the midst of the blackout." This aim he accomplishes by first giving the content of his own faith for this day,

and then by stating the grounds in mystic experience on which it rests. The first part of the book, which contains the items of his faith is warm and inspiring, and sounds a note of courageous Christian optimism in this "spiritual black-out." The latter part of the book, especially the last two chapters, which restate the noetic processes of the experience of such classic mystics as Plotinus, Meister Eckhart and Saint Teresa, adds little to the analysis either of other writers on the subject, or of his own earlier works.

The great need of our age, according to Dr. Jones, is to see the invisibles, the spiritual realities, behind the visibles; and for this task he is confident that not only the "spiritually *élite*," but quite ordinary people are competent. This "way of wonder" is that of the kind of creative vision exemplified at its highest in the Bible. With it can be discovered the meaning of the two great realities of life, "God and thy soul." This kind of vision sees in the dark. It apprehends that God, as the Book of Daniel points out (2:22), knows what is in the Dark. It recognizes that the periods of darkness have, "since creation's primal day," been followed by the periods of light. Furthermore, this faith discovers that the darkness does not put out the light, as he thinks the verse, "The darkness comprehendeth it not," (John 1:5), should be translated. Thus faith abides in the hour of greatest crisis.

This faith should enable our age to re-discover the realities of which it has lost sight, such as that God is still "writing His gospel" in the lives of the great Christians of our day, as of all days; that all things are ours, so that we should enlarge instead of constrict the areas of life; and that the Kingdom of God is an "existential reality now." We must get back to the springs and sources of life, and cultivate that inner substratum which lies below all our conscious desires and thoughts, but which we need to give direction to all our purposes and activities in

order to achieve a happy combination of the Mary and the Martha in us all. Then we shall be ready, as Dr. Jones strikingly phrases it, "to set our hearts towards the highway." He confesses with Julian Huxley that his final faith is in life. But we cannot build that life without taking into account the ultimate moral and spiritual principles on which the universe is grounded. Two of the most important of the latter are those of the freedom of the individual, an inheritance of American democracy from the Baptist, Roger Williams, and an optimistic view of human nature, the contribution of his opponent, George Fox. But both of these must be controlled and governed by an immediate experience of God, such as the great mystics had and used in their day, to become centers of creative energy to rebuild the world.

Inspiring as is Dr. Jones' own *credo*, the reader of the classic mystics is left with the question as to whether they did cope with problems equal in magnitude to those of our day, and whether they did fertilize their generation by translating their experiences into active endeavor great enough for the tasks of our day.

LOUISE S. EBY

Milwaukee-Downer College

Missions

Philosophy of the Christian World Mission.

By EDMUND D. SOPER, New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943. 314 pages. \$2.50.

The fact that this book was a Religious Book Club selection is an indication that it is an important book but it would still have been important had the readers of the Religious Book Club passed it by, for it deals with a subject of profound significance to Christianity, particularly at this present stage in its history. We have long been in need of just such a careful, intelligent discussion of the basic aspects of the Christian world mission. While we have had some

phases of the problem studied from time to time as in Hugh Vernon White's *Theology for Missions* and Kenneth Latourette's *Missions Tomorrow* there has not been a full length treatment of the whole subject for a long time.

The competence of Dr. Soper to write on the subject is universally recognized for he has long been associated in one way or another with the missionary enterprise and has won distinction as a student and teacher in the field of History of the non-Christian Religions which Christianity faces on its far flung mission line.

In his first chapter on the present situation he makes clear the need for confronting the problems of missions in the modern world. He recognizes that "the missionary enterprise has come to the end of an era and is entering another;" that while an increasing number of people are becoming interested in countries where Christian missions have been maintained, their interest in many cases has no missionary basis; that there have been significant changes in interpretation of the Bible and Christianity that call for a reinterpretation of missions; that interpretation of Christianity has entered a new phase; and finally that "the appeal of missions is not a compelling influence in the thought and life of large numbers of our churches." The book is then divided into four parts. The first, the Biblical background traces the growth of Universalism in the Old Testament, examines Jesus' attitude towards the world mission and follows the expanding church in its early missionary outthrust. Part 2 carries the history, obviously very briefly, through its penetration into a developed Greek and Roman culture, its spread among the barbarians of the North, and its expansion in the modern world to the farthest reaches of earth. This, while interesting, is probably the least valuable part of the book. The heart of the book is in the third part, Christianity as the World Religion. Here the author comes to grips with the meaning

of the Christian gospel, the missionary motive, and why Christianity should be taken to specific religions of the world, the Animists, the Hindus, the Buddhist, the Chinese, the Japanese, the Moslems, the Jews, and ends with a forthright declaration of what the author regards as the uniqueness of Christianity.

The fourth part, the Strategy of the World Missions, deals with Aims and Methods, the World Mission and Nationalism, Christianity and Indigenous Cultures, Missions and the World Church, and finally the Kingdom of God. An appendix gives at some length reasons for Protestant missions in Latin America where Christianity has been known for hundreds of years.

Dr. Soper's rather lengthy study of the Biblical basis for missions will prove satisfactory no doubt to liberals whose major missionary motive is not found in the Bible but it will probably not satisfy conservative minded folk for whom, at least theoretically, the Biblical basis for missions is a principal motivating force, and this is so because Dr. Soper quite frankly adopts the modern view of the Bible and hence cannot rest satisfied with mere proof texts which seem to justify the world mission. He very frankly faces the probability that the great commission was not spoken by Jesus and in so doing will seem to many to weaken greatly the command to go into all the world. Dr. Soper does, however, very adequately develop the fact that the logic of the teaching of Jesus is missionary in character even if the exact words were not his and this will seem to many much more important.

While Dr. Soper is not unmindful of other contributing motives such as the humanitarian and the desire to bring enlightenment to underprivileged peoples, the basic motive in the whole missionary enterprise is the religious one, namely that Christianity has something unique which other religions do not have and without which they are unable to meet the insistent needs of men. He takes a definitely critical posi-

tion of Professor Hocking's report in *Rethinking Missions* and his more recent utterance in his book *Living Religions and a World Faith*. Thoughtful persons who are not quite sure in their own minds with reference to the utter uniqueness of Christianity will do well to put these two points of view side by side and weigh them. Probably no better statement of either point of view has been made.

In his answer to the question, Why take Christianity to the various non-Christian faiths? there is an excellent analysis of the best that each non-Christian faith offers, given sympathetically and fairly. If at some points he does not seem to have evaluated as highly certain elements of other faiths as others might have done, the divergence is one of honest difference of opinion. The students of the History of Religion who approach these faiths from no missionary angle will profit by the attempt of Dr. Soper

to search out those elements which he finds lacking when comparing them with Christianity at its best. It would be a very worth while conference which would bring together on the same platform Professor Hocking and Dr. Soper on this exceedingly important matter.

The book, while adapted to general reading purposes, will find its greatest usefulness if made the basis of careful study. It would contribute greatly to the understanding and probably the appreciation of the whole missionary enterprise if pastor's conferences throughout the country were to form discussion groups around this book as a text; and certainly it ought to be made use of in theological seminaries where men are trained to carry on the work of the ministry, including of course, its extension to the peoples of all lands.

CHARLES S. BRADEN

Northwestern University

THE CONTRIBUTOR'S COLUMN

(Concluded from page 138)

Corinthians 15:32, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIII, 1924; Indications of Source for the Accounts of the Last Supper as given by the Synoptists and by St. Paul, privately printed, 1937. Of his translation, privately printed and presented to Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, of Maurice Goguel's *L'Eucharistie des Origins à Justin Martyr*, we are unable to give the date. "A Family of New Testament Cure Stories," alluded to toward the end of the paper published in this issue had never seen print.

L. B. HAZZARD is Professor of Religion at Illinois Wesleyan, having come to that position from a pastorate in Quincy, Illinois. He received his Ph. D. in 1927 from the University of Edinburgh and was formerly Assistant Professor in the Department of English Bible at Ohio Wesleyan.

EDGAR J. GOODSIZED writes from his present address, 551 Perugia Way, Bel-Air, Los Angeles, that he has recently completed a series of 39 weekly broadcasts on the New Testament over KFAC and has given a number of lecture series the past winter before clubs, churches, and other groups. He has been seeing a "Goodspeed Parallel New Testament" (with the King James) through the press, and working on one or two other books.

J. PAUL WILLIAMS is a member of the Department of the History and Literature of Religion at Mount Holyoke College. He is much concerned because religious education in general and especially on the college level is getting such indifferent attention from educational administration.

BOOK NOTICES

Christianity and Society

Christianity and Civilization. By H. G. WOOD. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943. 128 pages. \$1.25.

This little book consists of six lectures by H. G. Wood, Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham, delivered at Cambridge during Lent, 1942. The successive subjects dealt with are: I. Christianity and Civilization. II. Christianity and Scientific Humanism. III. Christianity and Marxist Philosophy. IV. The Christian Co-operative Commonwealth. V. The Christian Commonwealth in the International Order. VI. Good Friday, 1942.

The book is concerned with the spiritual crisis of the modern world and particularly with finding a basis for a renewing and strengthening of the elements of Liberty, Justice, Mercy and Truth in our social order. Professor Wood pays tribute to the scientific devotion to truth, but criticizes the so-called "scientific humanism" mainly on the grounds that it insists that truth may be found only in the scientific laboratory and that it plays with the notion that science can be in itself an arbiter of value. Marxist faith, particularly its devotion to justice, is better than its premises. In particular the author attacks the Marxist theories of the class war and of religion. While admitting the need of a planned society, Dr. Wood is concerned with the kind of a plan to be followed and the kind of *planners* to put the plan into operation. In this connection he quotes a discussion reported in Karl Mannheim's *Man and Society* in which a group of friends are considering not only the planning of production and distribution but even of man himself. "Then someone said, 'But who is to plan the planners?' And Mannheim says the question has haunted him ever since. And well it might. Scratch a planner and you find a dictator. Personally, I would trust no one with the task of planning, *unless he had that kind of humility which is associated with reverence for God and humanity*" (pp. 83, 84). The words italicized suggest the fundamental contribution Christianity has to make to the undergirding of a civilized order of human living.

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

The Bible

The Bible in Our American Life. By S. VERNON McCASLAND, Va. Council of Religious Education, Inc. Bridgewater, Va. 1942. xvi plus 230 pages. Mimeographed. \$2.00. In lots of 5, \$1.50.

THE LITERATURE OF THE BIBLE. A Complete Outline of the Course for the Year. By S. VERNON McCASLAND, University of Va. 33 pp.

Dr. McCasland, Professor of Religion in the University of Virginia has accepted responsibility for religious education outside his professional sphere. He has produced a text book, or rather manual, for High School students, which in an original and suggestive manner shows the religious basis of our American life. There are nearly one hundred lessons, divided fairly evenly, into five chapters: Religion in Our National Ideals, Religion in Our Morality, Our Christian Ceremonials, Our Jewish Ceremonials, Our Beliefs About the Universe. Each lesson covers two pages, one dealing with the author's introduction of the subject for the day, the other devoted to the assignment. This second page is allotted to Things to Read, The Facts, Interpretation, Things to Do. Under Facts and Interpretation are listed definite questions. It is a course rich in content, broad, liberal, unbiased. When it has been further tested it will in all probability be published in more permanent form. The author invites criticism and suggestions from the teachers who use it. The Virginia Council of Religious Education is to be congratulated on this pioneer volume which has such significant possibilities for increasing the students' appreciation of the place of religion in our American culture. The author uses it also as the basis for a course in the University.

The second title represents an outline of the author's elementary course on the Bible. The reviewer endowed with a normal amount of egotism continues to prefer her own, particularly in the New Testament field, convinced that two weeks to the Synoptic gospels and Acts as against four for Paul, does not represent justice to the former group.

MARY E. ANDREWS

Goucher College

The Man of the Hour. By WINIFRED KIRKLAND.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942.
pp. 171. \$1.75.

The Man of the Hour stands out as one of the best in the growing flood of new books on Jesus showing Him as eternally relevant to life.

Early influences upon Jesus such as the one he called father—Joseph, the marching soldiers, the insurrection, his friends, fellow workmen, all of these are interpreted in terms of what Jesus later did and thought. But like the gospels themselves, Miss Kirkland's book devotes most of the space to Jesus' own period of ministry on earth.

The motivating force, the central message of Jesus is presented in this book as his dream of the Kingdom of God, of the Kingdom of Heaven, of a social structure wherein dwelleth righteous men. The root of this concept which gained so great a hold upon the Traveller is, surely, the master prophetic concept from Isaiah.

The final chapter, "The Two Rulers," contrasts earthly kingship with the true kingship of one who has dared to adventure into the mysterious region where the power of God is available for those whose wills are at one with God's will.

L. E. TRAIN

North Park College

Seeing the Multitudes. By FREDERICK KELLER STAMM. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943. 129 pages. \$1.50.

The Master on the Mount. By CANON JAMES EDWARD WARD. New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company, 1943. 137 pages. \$1.50.

These two popular treatments of the Sermon on the Mount have several things in common. They are both written by men skilled in popularization and simplification. Canon Ward's book consists of fifteen addresses broadcast in Canada. Dr. Ward is chairman of the National Religious Advisory Council of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Dr. Stamm is a well known radio preacher as well as pulpit orator and pastor in this country. Both books consist of brief studies of different parts of the Sermon on the Mount. Typical chapter headings of Dr. Ward's book are "Not to Destroy, But to Fulfil," "Blessedness," "Be Not Anxious," and "Treasure in Heaven," while such topics as "The Gospel—Idealism or Realism," "As a Little Child," "The Inheritance of the Meek," and "Hunger and Thirst after Goodness," are found in Dr. Stamm's book. Because of the brevity and simplicity of treatment together with real insight into moral and religious values, both books would be of use for reference in an

introductory course dealing with the New Testament or the Life of Jesus.

The same limitation, in different degree, may be found in both books, and is in each case the defect of a virtue. The defect is one of oversimplification. "Start out tomorrow," writes Canon Ward "with two or three pages of this Sermon in your hand. Try to follow what they say."

Is it as simple as that? Is it wise to interpret the Sermon on the Mount as if it were as simple as that? Is it not such oversimplifications which lead the "man on the street" and the average college student to dismiss the Sermon on the Mount as impractical idealism?

Dr. Stamm is more realistic about the difficulties of the Sermon. He does not overlook the contradiction between Christianity and war, nor does he look for undeserved good to spring from this evil: "What the result of this (war) will be can be nothing less than the restricted influence of the church after the war, a world full of haters and a fine set up for another war" (p. 5). Dr. Stamm, at least once, relates Christian teaching to economic and social institutions instead of interpreting it in terms purely of a transformation of individual human lives: "People in this land of ours and elsewhere are deprived of the decencies of life which by rights belong to them, and woe to them by whom the offence cometh" (p. 61). Nothing in Canon Ward's book would offend the vested interests.

Neither book shows any acquaintance with the point of view presented by Dibelius in his book published in this country only two or three years ago. While the eschatological view need not be accepted as the only mode of interpretation—and while it may not be adapted to radio sermons!—yet it seems to do greater justice to the absolute quality of many parts of the Sermon on the Mount. Christianity never won adherents because it was easy!

CARL E. PURINTON

Beloit College

The First Authorized English Bible and the Cranmer Preface. By HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. ix. + 60 pages. \$1.00.

To celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the Great Bible series of 1539-41, Professor Willoughby has issued this attractive study of some significant and neglected features of the series. A chapter is devoted to the monumental character of the Regnault typography. A splendid facsimile of the title-page of the April 1540, Great Bible is included in the book, and a chapter is devoted

to its interpretation; "it is the most vivid and comprehensive pictorial record we have of the religio-political organization of Tudor society in England under Henry VIII," and it is not the work of Hans Holbein the Younger. The six pages of the prologue by Thomas Cranmer are reproduced in facsimile. A somewhat modernized rendering of it (done by Mr. Herndon Wagers) is included, and a chapter is devoted to the discussion of it. Myles Coverdale's contribution in editing the series of Bibles is appraised and an extensive bibliography is listed. Both in their format and in their influence, they were truly Great Bibles.

Elmira College.

ELMER W. K. MOULD.

Hammer and Sparks. The Bible in Our Literature. By WILLIAM FRANKLIN ANDERSON, New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1943. 234 pages. \$2.50.

The writer, a retired Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was formerly Professor of the History of Religions at Carleton College. Like other teachers of religious literature he appears to have been interested over a period of many years in accumulating literary parallels to passages of the Bible. In this volume a passage from the Bible together with one, two, or three brief parallels appears on each left-hand page together with a brief exposition and a prayer on opposite pages with the intention that the book be used for devotional purposes. The volume is divided into five sections labelled, "The Seer," "The Seekers," "Universe Speaking," "Fulfillment—Personal Character," and "Fulfillment—Social." The author explains that the "symbolic term 'hammer' is used as descriptive of the Word of God by the Prophet Jeremiah."

Beloit College

CARL E. PURINTON

The Throne of David. By A. G. HEBERT. New York: Moorehouse-Gorham Co., 1942. 277 pages. \$4.00.

The author of this volume is concerned over what he labels the "Marcionite" attitude of many Christians today toward the Old Testament. The tendency toward the rejection of parts or all of this Testament as unimportant both as sacred literature for Christians and as a part of Anglican liturgy has given rise to this study of the fulfillment of the Old in the New. This explanation or defense is based on the general supposition that while the Old Testament exhibits incompleteness in its fragmentary expression of God's will, it never the less takes on additional meaning in the light of the fuller revelation of the New Testament. The incomplete is now completed and the two sections of literature form a harmonized unity fully understood only as such a unity.

The method centers in the delineation of the figure of Jesus as traditionally interpreted in church doctrine and creed. Examining such topics as Messianic hope, the Law and righteousness in relation to salvation, the problem of exclusiveness and universalism and the idea of sacrifice. Mr. Hebert repeatedly points out the frustration of the Old Testament answers with the complementary fruition of the New Testament answer as summed up in the life and significance of Jesus the Christ. The result actually becomes a strong reaffirmation of traditional Christology.

The book is a curious admixture of Lower and Higher Criticism. Where the fruits of the more objective method do not disturb doctrine, they are freely used, but the right is always reserved to see a "mystical" interpretation which invariably leads the reader to the time honored position of the doctrinal church. In many passages the use and interpretation of the Old Testament is quite Pauline and first century. To the non-conformist the work has little to offer that is new or interesting.

Goucher College

EUGENE S. ASHTON

Teaching Religion

(Concluded from page 168)

come any time, war or no war, observe how the confusion of mind is aggravated by the tension between the Christian idea of God and war. Students come to me and to you at all times, in class and after class, in conference, and through the medium of papers like this, wanting to know. We cannot put them off. There was a time when many teachers of religion felt that the teaching of religion should be a coldly academic process. Anything other than that was "unscientific." They simply had not taught religion in war time. This is no mechanical task in which we can re-use material that we have already used again and again. This is no coldly intellectual task. This is a task that requires us to be very patient, very sympathetic, and yet to bear witness constantly to the faith that is in us. And if we try sympathetically to meet our pupils' needs, I do not believe we are likely to offend our constituency.

Teaching religion in war time is a task for a scholar, a prophet, and a saint. But few of these being available, it is a task that challenges the best that an ordinary man can do.

THE ASSOCIATION

A Tribute to the Retiring Treasurer

Our Association salutes Dr. Elmer W. K. Mould of Elmira College. His membership in N.A.B.I. has been of long standing. But it is for his loyalty and active co-operation that we honor him. As past president he has known the inner life of our organization and has contributed to its program. As a member of the Council he has been alert to details, as well as to broad plans for the larger usefulness of the Association.

Our special debt to him is for his services as treasurer of N.A.B.I., from and including 1938 to 1942. During that time the *Journal of Bible and Religion* has benefited by his efficient management of Association finances. Attention has been given by him to many prospective members. Prompt and orderly methods have characterized his administration of the arduous duties of his office. He has saved considerable sums by investing his own valuable time instead of employing help. He has had a large part in lifting our Association treasury from debt to surplus.

Always in attendance, never shirking his duties, and ready at all times to give his best, he has set us a notable example of work well done. But not all done! Far from it! He has resigned to carry on other work demanding his attention. His fidelity and friendliness are still with us. He is to act as one of the proofreaders of the *Journal*. Our gratitude and best wishes are with him. Again we salute him and wish him God-speed.

H. L. N.

Personnel

The following list of teachers is a supplement to the list published in the last issue of the *Journal*. Further information concerning those enrolled in the Exchange may be obtained by communicating with Dr. Eugene S. Ashton, Chairman, Committee on Vacancies, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland.

E-1—Woman; A.B. (Hist. & Rel.), Mt. Holyoke; B.D. (O.T.), Union Sem.; 2 yrs. grad. wrk., U. of Marburg; Ph.D. (Phil., Rel.), U. of Edinburgh. 12 yrs. teach. exper.

Desired subjects: Bib. Lit., Phil. of Rel., Hist. of Rel., Psych. of Rel., Theol., Rel. Educ. Can also teach; Phil. Logic, Ethics, Eng. Comp.

F-1—Woman; Attended West. Reserve U.; B.L. (Phil. & Bible), Ohio Wesleyan; 1 yr. grad. wrk. U. of Oxford; M.A.; B.D., Ph.D. (N.T. & Church Hist.), U. of Chicago; 1 yr. Law, West. Reserve U. 12 yrs. teach. exper. Desired subjects: Bible, Missions, Church Hist., Comp. Rel. Can also teach: N.T. Grk.

G-1—Man; A.B. (Eng.), Wash. & Lee U.; M.A. (Latin), T.C. Columbia U.; Additional work in Bible and Spanish. High Sch. teach. exper. Desired subjects: Bible. Can also teach: Spanish, Geom., Algebra.

N-1—Man; A.B. (Hist.), Maryville; Th.B. & Th.M. (Christ. Educ.), Princeton. 1 yr. grad. wrk. (Hist), U. of Pittsburgh. Desired subjects: Bible or Bib. Hist. Can also teach: Hist., Phil.

S-4—Man; Attended Carleton & U. of Minn.; A.B. (Phil.), Hamline; S.T.B. (Pract. Theol.), M.A. (O.T.), Ph.D. (N.T.), Boston U. 5 yrs. teach. exper. Desired subjects: Intro. to N.T. or O.T., Life and Teach. of Jesus, or Paul, Bib. Exegesis, Rel., Phil. Can also teach: Psych. & Phil. of Rel., Rel. Educ., Church Hist., Ethics, Logic.

T-1—Man; A.B. (Rel.) U. of Calif.; B.D. (Bible), Yale; Completing work on Ph.D. (O.T.), Yale. Desired subjects: O.T., N.T., Archeology. Can also teach: Church Hist., Astronomy, Photography.

W-3—Man; Attended the U. of Mich.; Ph.B. (Classics), M.A. (N.T.), Ph.D. (O.T.), U. of Chicago; B.D. (Bible), Chicago Theol. Sem. Holds certificate for 1 yr. of wrk. in Palestinian Hist. at Am. Sch. of Orient. Research. 9 yrs. teach. exper. Desired subjects: Bible, Phil. of Rel., Church Hist. Can also teach: Rel. Educ., Comp. Rel., Grk.